

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Julia1972>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ASSIMILATION AND EDUCATION: A STUDY OF POSTWAR
IMMIGRANTS IN EDMONTON AND CALGARY

by



WONG CHAK-SIN JULIA

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1972

The end
1972
129

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Assimilation and Education: A Study of Postwar Immigrants in Edmonton and Calgary by Wong Chak-sin Julia in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to look into the relationship between education and assimilation and to see in what ways education were related to assimilation. The data were taken from Dr. Fred Sukdeo's Alberta Migration Project, a research on postwar immigrants in Edmonton and Calgary.

Assimilation was defined as a process whereby an immigrant acquainted himself with the culture of the host society (cultural assimilation), participated in its institutions on an equal basis (integration assimilation) and identified himself as one of its members (identification assimilation). A scale of assimilation indicating both the behavioral and attitudinal aspects of these three components of assimilation was constructed from the results of a factor analysis done on the items chosen.

Cross-tabulations were used to test the tenability of the hypotheses formulated. It was found that immigrants with higher level of education tended to be more assimilated than those with lower level of education, and those who felt themselves being discriminated against by the host members were less likely to be assimilated than those who felt themselves being equally treated by the host members. Even among immigrants with

the same level of education and similar perception of the presence of discrimination in the host society, those educated in Canada were more likely to assimilate into the host society than those not educated in Canada.

One interesting finding was that persons with high level of education were more integrated into the institutions of the host society while those educated in Canada were more likely to identify themselves with the host members. It was also found that there were differences in the degree of assimilation among immigrants from different ethnic groups even when the level of education, age of arrival or other variables were controlled.

Based on these findings, it was ~~conc~~cluded that education was related to assimilation in three ways - the qualification provided by the number of years of education one received, the cultural bias of the education system and the opportunities for interaction provided by one's education. It was also concluded that interaction with the host members within the education institution, i.e. having education in Canada affected assimilation in two ways - encouraging more contact with the host members and changing one's frame of reference.

These findings seemed to indicate that the present Canadian immigration policy of emphasising the education level of the immigrants was a wise **one**, but it was suggested that preference might be given to those who had already been educated in Canada.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to the three members of my thesis committee, Professor M. K. Bacchus, Professor M. Gillespie and Professor R. S. Pannu for their suggestions and advice; and especially to Professor M. K. Bacchus, my supervisor, for his constructive criticism and guidance in the preparation of this thesis.

My sincere appreciation and gratitude are extended to Dr. F. Sukdeo for acquainting me with his project and making available to me the data of his research. I also like to thank Dr. D. Flathman and Mr. J. Hansen for their invaluable advice in data analysis; and Mrs. Y. F. Woon for her inspiration and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical justification of the study	
Practical justification of the study	
The study	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES	13
The concept of assimilation	
Concepts often confused with assimilation	
Assimilation	
Review of literature	
Multi-causal theorists	
Mono-causal theorists	
The hypotheses	
Summary	
III. METHODOLOGY	47
The Alberta Migration Project	
Sampling	
The drafting of the questionnaire	
Interviewing	
Coding	
The measurement of assimilation	
Multiple indices of assimilation	
Cultural assimilation	
Integration assimilation	
Identification assimilation	
Construction of the assimilation scale	

CHAPTER		Page
	The methods of analysis	
	Dependent variables	
	Independent variables	
	Control variables	
	Summary	
IV.	FINDINGS	74
	Hypothesis 1	
	Hypothesis 2	
	Hypothesis 3	
	Hypothesis 4	
	Summary	
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	97
	Summary	
	Discussion	
	Assimilation	
	Education and assimilation	
	Interaction and assimilation	
	Comparison of ethnic groups	
	Practical implication for government immigration policy	
APPENDIX:		
A.	Survey questionnaire	120
B.	Assimilation scale	147
C.	Independent and control variables.....	152
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	153

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I-1	Immigrants entering Canada by Intended Occupation (1946-70)	7
I-2	Immigrants (in thousands) entering Canada by Country of Last Residence	7
III-1	Distribution of the Sample by Residence and Composition	50
III-2	Items to be Included in the Assimilation Scale	63
III-3	Components of the Assimilation Scale.....	66
IV-1	Relationship between the Level of Education and Assimilation standardized on Ethnic Origin and (a) Age of Arrival, (b) Year of Arrival into Canada of the Respondents	76
IV-2	Relationship between the Level of Education and Assimilation standardized on the Year of Arrival into Canada	78
IV-3	Relationship between the Level of Education and Assimilation standardized on Age of Arrival into Canada	79
IV-4	Relationship between the Place of Education and Assimilation standardized on Ethnic Origin and the Level of Education	80
IV-5	Relationship between the Place of Education and Assimilation standardized on Level of Education	83
IV-6	Relationship between Perceived Discrimination and Assimilation standardized on the Level of Education and the Ethnic Origin of the Respondents	86

Table		Page
IV-7	Relationship between Discrimination and Assimilation standardized on the Level of Education and Place of Education of the Respondents	88
IV-8	Relationship between Discrimination and Assimilation standardized on (a) Education in Canada, (b) Level of Education of Respondents from 'Third World Countries.	88
IV-9	Relationship between the Place of Education and Assimilation standardized on the Level of Education and the Ethnic Origin of the Respondents	92
IV-10	Relationship between the Place of Education and Assimilation standardized on the Level of Education	92
V-1	Distribution of Scores of the Assimilation Scale by Ethnic Origin of the Respondents .	113

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The assimilation of immigrants was a popular issue in the heyday of European and Asian migration to the United States in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and still remains as important a problem in present day Canada. While some attribute the vigour and growth of the United States to the diversity of the ethnic groups which migrated there, others see such migration as a threat to the very core of the nation's heritage. Conflict and misunderstanding occur among them, and assimilation of these different ethnic groups is regarded by many as the solution to the problem.

The assimilation of immigrants is a pressing problem for Canada also, for she has become the destination of many migrants from extremely diverse backgrounds. With the restrictions imposed by the United States on the entry of immigrants and the relaxation of the immigration laws by Canada, many immigrants have now made this country their destination. The number of immigrants to Canada increased by nearly 130% over the past two decades, from 400,000 in the five postwar years to 910,000 between 1966-1970.

Not only has there been an increase in the number of immigrants, but also there has been quite a change in their characteristics. In the immediate postwar years, the immigrants were predominantly British, but now there is a grea-

ter diversity in their ethnic origin. Because of this, the problem of their assimilation in Canadian society becomes a more urgent one.

There is a great confusion in the literature over the meaning of assimilation and sociologists have not as yet reached a consensus on the meaning of the concept. Some have stressed the structural aspects of assimilation, others the cultural and the psychological aspects. Some sociologists have suggested factors as culture or race as the major factors which affect the rate of assimilation, while others emphasize the importance of the work situation or the type of neighbourhood in which immigrants reside.

There is also a paucity of material dealing with the assimilation of immigrants in Canada including a lack of literature on the relation between education and assimilation in this country. This study attempts to fill some of these gaps- to come to a working definition of assimilation, to study the assimilation of postwar immigrants in Alberta, and to look into some factors, especially education in relation to assimilation.

Theoretical justification of the study

The literature on assimilation is immense and a more complete review of the literature will be done in the next two chapters. The purpose here is to justify writing

on the topic on which a fairly voluminous literature already exists.

The bulk of the literature comes from countries with a long tradition of immigration. It is not surprising then that most of it is of an American origin, and is represented by the works of Park (1926), Gordon (1955) and Hughes (1952).¹ Their works represent only a few of those engaged in studying the assimilation of immigrants in America.

On the other hand, there is a dearth of material on the assimilation of immigrants in Canada. The more well known are Reynold's study of the British, Hobart's study of the Ukrainians, Kosa's on the Hungarians or Barclay's on the Muslims.² However all these are isolated studies, and most of them concentrate on the structural aspects as integration into the employment or social sectors.

And in all these works, numerous attempts have been made to establish the relation between assimilation and many independent variables as age, length of stay, social class origin, to mention but a few. Though education has been recognized as an important agent of socialization

1. R.E. Park, Old World Traits Transplanted, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925; M.M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, New York: Oxford University Press, 1955; E.C. Hughes, Where Peoples Meet, Glencoe The Free Press.
2. L.G. Reynolds, The British Immigrant, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1935; C.W. Hobart, Persistence and Change, University of Alberta, 1970; J. Kosa, Land of Choice, Toronto, University of Toronto Press; H.B. Barclay, "An arab Community", Anthropologica, Vol. 10, p. 143-156.

of the individual into society, it has generally been overlooked as an independent variable in assimilation studies. Even when education is mentioned, attempt is only made to investigate whether or not any relationship exists between education and assimilation. No effort is made to analyse how education affects assimilation. This study therefore concentrates on this much neglected field.

Practical Justification of the Study

In addition to its theoretical value, this study also has practical relevance. With the emphasis on education as the criterion for admitting immigrants into Canada by the government since 1962, the importance of education in the assimilation of the immigrants needs to be more fully understood if one is to assess this government's policy in this field.

Canada's immigration policy in the postwar years till 1962 was governed by an act of 1910. In 1947, Mackenzie King reiterated its fundamental elements in the House of Commons,

The policy of the government is to foster the growth of the population of Canada by the encouragement of immigration. The government will seek by legislation, regulation and permanent settlement of such numbers of the immigrants as can be advantageously absorbed in our national economy.... the people of Canada do not wish as a result of mass immigration

to make a fundamental alteration in the character of our population.³

In other words, the policy of the government was designed to attract permanent settlers who were needed to help to develop the Canadian economy without changing the ethnic character of the population. Hence one of the main criteria for immigration was the ethnic origin of the immigrants - they had to be ethnically like the existing population, which meant they were to be of European and mainly British origin.

In the postwar years, it was recognized that Canada needed more manpower to develop her resources and to facilitate the country's defence.⁴ The emphasis in the first ten years after the Second World War was still upon group migration from Europe for employment in agriculture and certain other industries where labour was difficult to obtain. Immigrants were required to open up the Prairies. During these ten years, about 30% of all the immigrants entering Canada gave agriculture as their intended occupation.

However by the fifties, Canada was becoming indus-

3. Comments made by Prime Minister, Mackenzie King, quoted from D.C. Corbett, Canada's Immigration Policy, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957, p.3.

4. H.F. Angus, "The Future of Immigration into Canada", Canadian Journal of Economic and Political Science, Vol. XII, 1946, p. 379-386.

trialized and required industrial rather than agricultural workers. But the government lacked any long term planning,⁵ and instead continued to encourage the immigration of farmers. In the years of unemployment when the protests from the workers were strong, the government would announce a limit to the number of immigrants coming into Canada in the following year.⁶ In spite of this lack of planning, there was a steady increase in the number of immigrants in the professional categories manufacturing and construction industries coming into Canada. As seen in Table I-1, the percentage of immigrants who came to work in agriculture fell from 34% in 1946-50 to 3.6% in 1966-70 while those in the professional, manufacturing and managerial occupations rose from 34.7% to 61.4% in the same period.

One of the basic assumptions underlying Canadian immigration policy was that the British immigrants would be more readily absorbed than those from other countries. Because of the absence of a serious language barrier and the presence of a close connection, cultural and political, with the mother country through the Commonwealth, special preference was given to immigrants from Britain. To allay the fears of the Quebec politicians who had always been jealous to preserve their ethnic identity and were afraid that increased immigration would simply mean an addition

5. W. Petersen, Planned Migration, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955, p. 119.

6. W. Petersen, *ibid.*, p. 139-159.

TABLE I-1: IMMIGRANTS ENTERING CANADA BY INTENDED OCCUPATION
(1946-70)

Occupation	Percent				
	1946-50	1951-55	1956-60	1961-65	1966-70
Managerial		1	1.2	2.5	2.8
Professional	4.4	8.3	11.4	21.5	26.5
Clerical	7.6	7.2	10.7	13.4	14.1
Transport	3.2	2	2.6	1.5	1.5
Commerce	5.5	3.4	4.1	3.5	3.5
Service	9.3	11.7	14.9	13.1	9.8
Agriculture	34.5	20	9.6	5	3.6
Manufacture	30.3	32.2	30.9	29.8	32.1
Labour	2.9	12.3	14	9.5	5.1
Others	2.3	1	0.6	0.3	1.2
Total number Labour Force	207,000	429,000	413,000	248,000	477,000
% of total Immigration	48.1	54.2	52.7	49.7	52.6

Source: Canadian Statistical Review, D.B.S., Ottawa, 1946-71.

TABLE I-2: IMMIGRANTS (IN THOUSANDS) ENTERING CANADA BY
COUNTRY OF LAST RESIDENCE (1946-1970)

Country of Last Residence	1946-1950		1951-1955		1956-1960		1961-1965		1966-1970	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
British	168	39	203	26	232	30	121	24	235	26
European										
French	5	1	24	3	17	2	18	4	36	4
German	10	2	135	17	90	11	32	6	39	4
Italian	20	4	111	14	129	17	90	18	103	11
Dutch	26	7	84	10	38	5	9	2	165	2
Others	136	32	139	18	164	21	94	19	169	19
Others	66	15	96	12	113	14	137	27	308	34
Total	430	100	792	100	783	100	501	100	906	100

Source: Canadian Statistical Review, D.B.S., Ottawa, 1946-71.

to the English speaking population of Canada, the immigrants from France were placed on equal footing as those from Britain. Despite the special status given to the French, they constituted less than 3% of the total entries over the postwar years as compared to 33% for those coming from Britain. (See Table I-2)

In 1951 a new regulation was introduced which broadened the basis of admission of immigrants from Europe. Any European who satisfied the Canadian government that he was a 'suitable and desirable immigrant having regard to the climatic, social, educational, industrial, labour and other conditions of requirements of Canada'⁷ was admissible. This resulted in an increased percentage of Europeans from outside Britain and France coming into Canada. The percentage rose from 46% in the five postwar years to 63% in the five years following 1951. In practice, these Europeans came mainly from northwestern Europe.

Under this act, loans were provided by the government towards the cost of transportation to Canada for immigrants of approved employment. Landed immigrants could sponsor relatives if they could provide accomodation, assist in

7. D.C. Corbett, Canada's Immigration Policy, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957, p. 52-53.

finding employment and guarantee that the immigrant would not become a public charge. The sponsorship system had a snowballing effect and in the late 1950's, the number of Italian immigrants entering Canada equalled and sometimes surpassed those of Britain.

Largely as a gesture to Commonwealth relations, agreements were concluded in 1951 with India, Pakistan and Ceylon to admit certain number of immigrants from these countries. However the numbers of immigrants from these regions entering Canada remained small and the quota was not filled.

Until the year 1962, preferential status was given to persons of British birth and nationality, together with those from France and the United States. Second order preference was given to immigrants from Western European countries if they had certain approved skills or qualifications. Persons from other countries no matter how well qualified they were could not enter Canada unless sponsored by a close relative with the exception of the small quota previously granted to the governments of India, Ceylon and Pakistan.⁸ However with the growth of humanitarianism and liberalism on the world scene, Canada could no longer stick to her blatant discriminatory policy of screening immigrants on ethnic or racial grounds.

8. A. Richmond, Post-war Immigrants in Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967, p. 10-11.

The Canadian economy also showed signs of recession in 1958 and the downtrend continued till late 1961. Immigration policy became an issue which the government could no longer ignore and the result was the new Immigration Act of 1962. This act marked a turning point in the Canadian immigration policy. The most significant character of the act was the emphasis on skill and professional qualification of potential immigrants. Primary stress was laid on training, education and skill. These were the main conditions of admissibility to Canada regardless of the country of origin of the applicant. If a person was qualified on these grounds, he was admissible only subject to the normal requirements of good health, good character, without regard to race or colour. Sponsorship was extended to immigrants with firm employment opportunities.

The White Paper of 1966⁹ did not show any departure from the policy of 1962, but only represented an attempt at rationalizing the existing administration. It stated that there should be no discrimination by race or colour, and emphasized the economic aspect of immigration and the need for a higher proportion of well-educated immigrants who it was felt would be better able to adapt themselves to the demand of an advanced technological society.

As a result there was an increase of immigrants entering Canada from countries outside Europe and the North American continent. The percentage of this group of immi-

9. "Canadian Immigration Policy", Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1966.

grants from outside Europe rose from 14% in the years 1956-60 to 34% in 1966-70. The total number of immigrants who belonged to the **pr**ofessional classes also rose from 11% in the five years preceding to the passing of the act to 22% in the five years after 1961. This increase in the percentage of immigrants entering the professional class reflected an improvement in the educational level of the immigrants entering Canada.

In reviewing immigration into Canada in these post-war years, two main changes in the characteristics of the immigrants could be seen - a) the increasing diversity in the ethnic origin of the immigrants and b) an increasingly higher level of education among immigrants. The turning point of these two changes was the 1962 Immigration Act which shifted the emphasis from ethnicity to education as the major criterion for accepting immigrants to Canada. One of the aspects of this new policy was the greater stress on economic considerations, that is, the possibility that the immigrants could contribute to the economic development of Canada, possibly to the detriment of social and cultural aspects. Whether the higher level of education of the immigrants would facilitate the economic expansion of Canada is a question for the economist to answer. But whether a high level of education would increase or reduce the difficulties with which immigrants are assimilated is a question on which this study will attempt to throw some light.

The Study

The study is an attempt to investigate the assimilation of postwar immigrants in Alberta. The data for this study is taken from the Alberta Migration Project¹⁰ carried out in the spring of 1971 by Dr. F. Sukdeo on the Albertans, migrants and immigrants of Edmonton and Calgary. This present study is only concerned with the immigrant group. Immigrants are defined here as people who were not born in Canada but moved into the country after 1946 and are presently holding the status of landed immigrant or Canadian citizen. The principal aims of the study are: to aim at a definition of assimilation, to develop a scale of assimilation, to develop hypotheses about major factors contributing to assimilation, to see if any relationship between education and assimilation exists and to see how education affects assimilation.

10. For further details of the study, see F. Sukdeo's Alberta Migration Project, Report 1-10, Edmonton: H.R.R.C., 1971-2.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESIS

The subject of assimilation is of interest to many disciplines and the literature on assimilation is to be found in books and journals in such fields as psychology, biology, economics and philosophy. The present review of literature is only concerned with sociology books and journals covering a period from 1930 to 1970. Within this scope of survey, the literature on assimilation ranges from very general textbook type of work to regional and detailed studies of one particular situation and from highly theoretical speculations to highly empirical studies. Its vast volume renders a complete review of literature an impossible task. In the following review, therefore, I shall concentrate on theoretical material dealing with factors which contribute to assimilation and hope eventually to come to a working hypothesis on the relationship between assimilation and other variables. But before going into the review of literature, I shall first attempt to clarify the concept of assimilation.

THE CONCEPT OF ASSIMILATION

Concepts often confused with assimilation

The two main concepts often confused with assimilation are acculturation and integration.

Acculturation is the process whereby a person acquires the cultural traditions, patterns of life and values of a

different culture. It also involves the adoption of the material things from members of that culture. The taking over of the values of upward mobility by immigrants from the United States is an example of acculturation.

The process of acculturation may occur not only among immigrants but also among others who are not. A person can acquire the values, habits of members of a certain society through books, movies and other forms of mass media, without ever coming into direct social contact with any of the members. But acculturation is an important aspect of the assimilation of immigrants. Conflicts between immigrants and the members of the host society often result from the gap that sometimes develops between acculturation and integration, that is, when immigrants have accepted the culture of the host members and then are denied participation on an equal basis.

Integration is defined as a process whereby an immigrant participates on an equal basis in all the social institutions of the host society. A person who has achieved integration is no longer segregated from the dominant group members. The immigrant has access to all occupation on the basis of individual merits without reference to his racial or cultural inheritance. With integration, there is a complete dispersion of the immigrants within the main institutional sphere of the absorbing society. The immigrant is inseparable from the members of the host

society in terms of their participation in the social organizations of the dominant group, although on the psychological level, ethnic consciousness may still persist. When this happens, integration can still be said to have taken place.

Assimilation

The accepted definition of assimilation has varied from decade to decade and from sociologist to sociologist. In the thirties, Park referred to assimilation as:¹

the name given to the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages occupying a common territory achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain national unity.

Earlier he and Burgess had defined the concept as:²

the process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons or groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by, sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life.

A. Lesser in The Pawnee Ghost Dance³ gave this definition of assimilation:

the process of transforming aspects of a conquered or engulfed culture into a status of relative adjustment to the forms of the ruling culture.

1. R.E. Park, "Assimilation" in Encyclopaedia of the Social Science, New York: Macmillan, Vol. 2, 1930, p. 281.
2. R.E. Park & G.W. Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933, p. 735.
3. A. Lesser, The Pawnee Ghost Dance: A Study of Cultural Change, New York: Columbia University Press, 1933, p. ix.

From the above quotations, it can be seen that in the thirties assimilation was regarded as a more advanced stage of acculturation. Assimilation occurs when persons not only acquire the values and outlooks of the host society but are sufficiently 'incorporated' into its culture to 'sustain' a national unity'. Further Lesser seems to imply that assimilation is a one-way process whereby members of the minority group⁴ adopt the culture of the dominant society without considering any change of the dominant culture in the process of contact.

This is not the picture which emerged in the fifties. Both Dohrewend and Spiro criticized this view and emphasized that assimilation is a two-way process by which aspects of the two cultures mingle and merge. It involves active participation not only of members of the minority group but that of the dominant group. It is not only the adoption of the culture of the host society by the immigrants but the 'recruitment of members of culture A into the structural activities of culture B in position of equal status.'⁵ Spiro emphasized the participation dimension, he proposed⁶

that the disappearance of group identity through non-differential association and exogamy ...be distinguished from acculturation which is the acquisition of culture of the dominant group.

-
4. Lesser was talking about the assimilation of colonized, conquered or engulfed indigenous groups . Like the immigrants, they are a type of minority group.
 5. B.P. Dohrewend and R.J. Smith, "Assimilation" in Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 18, 1962, p.30-46.
 6. M.E. Spiro, "Acculturation of American Ethnic Groups", American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, 1955, p. 1241-1251.

But proceeded to add:⁷

assimilation may proceed only with the consent of the dominant group. Specifically, the acculturation of ethnic groups in the United States is an exclusive function of the group's desire and capacity... but assimilation is a function of both the dominant and ethnic group behavior. And in some cases, even when the ethnic group desires assimilation, the dominant group prevents it.

Assimilation is then regarded as a process in which members of the minority can participate on equal basis in the institutions of the host society.

In the sixties the concept of assimilation acquired a psychological dimension. T. Shibutani and M.K. Kwan in their work Ethnic Stratification, A Comparative Approach defined it as:⁸

basically a psychological transformation. When a person of Irish ancestry no longer conceives of himself as an Irishman but as an American, he is well on the way.

I tend to adopt Shibutani and Kwan's definition of assimilation, though I admit that acculturation and integration do seem to form a part of the assimilation process. But what distinguishes assimilation from either of these two processes is the psychological transformation which the immigrant undergoes when he perceives himself as a member of the host group. Only by recognizing the psychological change

7. M.E. Spiro, op. cit., p. 1241-51.

8. T. Shibutani and M.K. Kwan, Ethnic Stratification, A Comparative Approach, London: Macmillan Co., 1969, p. 121.

in the identification of the immigrant can the confusion in the concept of assimilation be resolved and the distinction made between integration and assimilation or acculturation and assimilation.

This distinction between assimilation on one hand and integration and acculturation on the other can be illustrated in the case of the second generation immigrant in a society where discrimination and involuntary segregation are practised. This person is an acculturated individual who has acquired the skills and values shared by members of the host society. But since he is not given the chance to integrate into the host society, he does not lose his group consciousness, that is he is not assimilated.

Integration and acculturation together also do not necessarily lead to assimilation. A person may speak the language of the host society and adopt its way of life, he may participate on an equal basis in all its institutions. He has friends from the host society and participate in their clubs and associations. However this does not necessarily mean that the person is assimilated. Saenger⁹ has suggested that the person may be doing all this just to establish interpersonal contact of some sort because any contact is better than none. It is only a way to kill his loneliness. But his strong sense of ethnic consciousness and group identification

9. G. Saenger, Today's Refugees, Tomorrow's Citizens, New York: Harper, 1941, p. 166.

may persist.

In other words, what makes a person fully assimilated is when he stops identifying himself as a member of the minority group or an outsider and regards himself as a member of the larger host society. Assimilation is not just the participation on an equal basis in all the institutions of the host society or the adoption of the culture of that society. In this study, therefore, the concept of assimilation would be treated as having three components: (a) acculturation which shall be referred to as cultural assimilation; (b) integration which shall be referred to as integration assimilation; and (c) psychological transformation which shall be referred to as identification assimilation.

Three Types of Assimilation

However different societies put different emphasis on the three components of assimilation. One society may demand a greater degree of cultural assimilation from the immigrants while another may stress on their integration into the institutions of the host society. To understand assimilation as a social process, one has to view it in the context of the structure of the given society.

As a result of the different conceptions of the nature of society held by the dominant group, three main types of assimilation can be identified: Anglo-conformity, melting-pot theory and cultural pluralism.¹⁰

10. M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, New York: Oxford University Press, 1955, p. 85.

'Anglo-conformity' theory demanded the complete renunciation of the immigrant's ancestral culture in favour of the behavior and values of the Anglo-Saxon core group; the 'melting pot' idea envisaged a biological merger of the Anglo-Saxon peoples with other immigrant groups and a blending of their respective cultures into a new indigenous American type; and 'cultural pluralism' postulated the preservation of the communal life and significant portions of the culture of the later immigrant groups within the context of American citizenship and political and economic integration into the American society.

The underlying assumption of Anglo-conformity theory is the desirability of maintaining cultural homogeneity in society to uphold the culture of the dominant group. In American society, English institutions (as modified by the American society), English language and English-oriented cultural patterns were upheld as the standard patterns in American life in the early nineteenth century. The emphasis in this view of society is cultural assimilation and identification assimilation. The development of a common culture in line with that of the dominant group is the end product of assimilation.

In a conception of society influenced by the melting pot theory, assimilation is envisaged as a process whereby all groups will merge their cultures and previous sense of peoplehood into a new culture and a larger national entity, which is an entity distinct from its component parts. The immigrant group is expected to assimilate in all three aspects- cultural, integration and identification assimila-

tion. In this conception of society, in theory all ethnic groups contribute equally to the end product. In practice, however, it is not that different from Anglo-conformity. As immigrants move into the host country in small numbers at various times, they are not merely melted but are 'transmuted and so do not affect the original material as might be expected'.¹¹ In effect, both the Anglo-conformity and melting pot theory envisage a society with homogeneous culture and the latter emphasising more the integration of immigrants. Both theories see the assimilation of immigrants as the disappearance of the immigrants' communal identity and the absorption of them as individuals into the existing society.

In a conception of society based on cultural pluralism, the goal of assimilation is to maintain enough sub-societal separation to guarantee the continuance of the ethnic and cultural tradition, and the existence of the immigrant group without at the same time interfering their functioning in the society. Assimilation in this type of society stresses cooperation among groups to function within a national framework. Unlike the rigid approach of the two former kinds of society, it is possible to maintain separate subcultures and subsocieties. The key

11. G.R. Stewart, American ways of Life, New York : Doubleday, 1954, p. 23, quoted from M. Gordon, op. cit., p. 128.

variables in this kind of assimilation are integration into and identification with the host society as a national unity. It is to this latter type of assimilation that the assimilation of immigrants in Canada belong. Having identified the type of assimilation in Canadian society, we now turn to the factors which influence the degree of assimilation of the immigrants.

• DETERMINANTS OF ASSIMILATION

Theorists who have been interested in studying the causes of assimilation fall very roughly into two groups. The first group is the multi-causal theorists who attribute a number of causes to this process, the other group is the monist theorists who put forward a single cause to explain the situation.

Multi-causal theorists

Sociologists who advanced the multi-causal theories of assimilation show that assimilation cannot be attributed to a single cause but is the result of a complexity of factors, some of which are more important in certain circumstances than the others.

Examples of such sociologists are Simpson and Yinger,¹²

¹². G.E. Simpson and J.M. Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, New York: Harper, 1958.

Allport¹³, Stonequist¹⁴ to mention but a few. They argue that variables such as race, culture and economic conditions influence assimilation in different degrees and in different combinations in different circumstances. At one time and in one place, cultural diversities or racial differences might be the salient factors. At another time and in another place, fear of economic competition, jealousy and economic exploitations might be the cause. More likely, these variables might be combined in different ways unique to the situation. As each situation is unique in itself, it is hopelessly futile to find one single variable to explain assimilation in all situations.

Mono-causal theorists

This group of sociologists who adopts a single causal approach to the study of assimilation can be subdivided into two groups:

-
- 13. G.H. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, New York: Doubelday, 1958.
 - 14. E.V. Stonequist, The Marginal Man, New York : Scribner, 1937.

1. those concentrating on background factors which explain assimilation
2. those concentrating on the social situation in which assimilation occurs.

1. Sociologists concentrating on background factors which explain assimilation.

There are many factors which have been used in explaining the process of assimilation. These factors are geographical factor, cultural factor, economic factor and political factor and education factor.

a. Geographic and temporal factors

Watson¹⁵ in his article "Caste as a form of Acculturation" argues that the farther an immigrant's homeland is from the host country, the more difficult it is for assimilation to occur. The argument behind it is that geographic distance between the home country of the immigrant and the host country might reflect the degree of cultural distance between the host and the immigrant. The farther away is the former country, the greater is the cultural difference.

On the other hand there are findings which contradict this hypothesis. Borrie argues that the emotional attachment of the immigrant to the home country appears to be

15. J.B. Watson, "Caste as a Form of Acculturation", Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 19, 1963, p.356-379.

negatively correlated with the distance of settlement.¹⁶ Where the distance is greater, the settlers tend to assimilate more quickly because proximity to the homeland enables the immigrant to return frequently and makes the severing of ties with the homeland harder.

With regard to the time factor, the view is often put forward that the third and fourth generation immigrants show a greater degree of assimilation than the first and second generation immigrants. This is due to the increased dilution and gradual loss of the culture which the immigrants originally brought. It is thus suggested that the longer the stay in the host country, the greater the degree of assimilation. However other findings have shown that though the length of residence in the host country has some bearing on the degree of assimilation, it fails to explain satisfactorily all the variations observed. For example, Beshner¹⁷ using residential segregation as an index of assimilation found that while old and new immigrants can be readily differentiated within an ethnic group there are considerable differences in the rate of assimilation among different ethnic groups. This leads one to suggest that there might be another set of factors to account for the different rate of assimilation.

16. W.D. Borrie, The Cultural Integration of Immigrants, Paris: UNESCO, 1959.

17. J. Beshner, "Ethnic Congregation", Social Force, Vol. 42, 1964, p. 482-489.

b. cultural factor

E.K. Francis ¹⁸ advocates the view that a group may voluntarily set itself apart because of its consciousness of belonging to a distinct and often incompatible culture. Language, religious and social institutions unique to an ethnic group inhibit social intercourse with members of another culture.

However this explanation of cultural incompatibility has two major weaknesses. From a methodological point of view, compatibility is extremely difficult to establish and is liable to subjective interpretations. Different sociologists may emphasise different aspects of culture. For example, it is commonly held that Japanese and American cultures are very different from each other, yet Broom and Kitsuse¹⁹ hold that American Japanese cultures are quite similar in their emphasis on achievement and education.

It is also held that a well-organized community life retards assimilation. Spiro²⁰ finds that a religion which organizes members of an immigrant group around sacred symbolism which is opposed to that of the dominant group retards assimilation. However the Chinese with no strong religious affiliations are equally slow

18. E.K. Francis, "Variables in the Formation of So-called Minority Groups", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 60, 1954, p. 6-14.

19. L. Broom and J.I. Kitsuse, "Validation of Acculturation", American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, 1955, p. 44-48.

20. M.E. Spiro, op. cit., p. 1241-1251.

to assimilate. Another example can be found with the British in Canada. Richmond has shown that the British who participate in the community life of their own ethnic group are more assimilated than those who do not take part in its activities. The ethnic associations are agents of socialization promoting in their members a desire to become naturalised Canadians.²¹ The cultural factor again fails to explain the difference in the assimilation of individuals.

c. Racial factor

Advocates of this view argue that physical visibility more than cultural incompatibility accounts for the persistence of group consciousness. Physical characteristics are more easily distinguished than cultural attributes and may be used as a basis of discrimination and segregation.²² In addition, physical visibility is inherited whereas cultural traits are acquired and can be changed with the passing of time. For example, though accent, etc. can be used as a basis of discrimination, the third or even second generation immigrant can get rid of this whereas the same does not apply to such characteristics as skin colour.

M.L. Barron²³ examines the rate of intermarriage and concludes that cultural minorities have the highest rate

21. A. Richmond, op. cit., p. 276-7.

22. Discrimination is the unequal treatment of groups considered to be different. Segregation is the act, process or state of being separated. Discrimination is the reflection of the attitude of the host country, and segregation is an index of assimilation.

23. M.L. Barron, People Who Intermarry, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1948, p. 11.

of intermarriage (an index of assimilation) as compared with religious and racial minorities.²⁴ Isaacs²⁵ insists that race, to a greater extent than cultural difference is the basis of discrimination. He points out that even among the coloured people, the light skinned Algerians and Egyptians despise their darker brethren in the south. In Jamaica, differential treatment according to people of various shades of colour is also present.

However the theory that racial incompatibility is the only factor which accounts for the lack of assimilation is discredited by many case studies. In Hawaii, the rate of intermarriage among the white and the natives who belong to a darker race is high.²⁶ In contrast, the Jews who are not physically distinguishable from the dominant group in the United States are being discriminated against. Also in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Chinese were discriminated against on the west coast of the United States and not so much in the east, were discriminated against at one time and not another. Hence there needs to be other factors which explain these fluctuations.

d. Economic factor

It has been argued that economic jealousy, fear and exploitations lead to uneasy relations between the

24. A minority group who receives differential treatment from the host members because of their religious difference is a religious minority. When the differential treatment is based on race, it becomes a racial minority.

25. E.R. Isaacs, "Group Identity", Daedalus, 1967, p.353-7.

26. M.L. Barron, Minorities in a Changing World, New York: Knopf, 1967, p. 121-133.

immigrants and the host members. This leads to economic discrimination by members of the host society which prevents the assimilation of the immigrants.

Cressey²⁷ shows that in the early period of colonial India, the British encouraged intermarriage, but the policy changed when the Anglo-Indians began to compete for high posts with the British. Cox²⁸ explaining the lack of intermarriage between the whites and the negroes in the United States suggests that the dominant group wants segregation to protect their economic domination. The same point has been advanced as the reason why the workers in America disliked the Asian immigrants. They were competitors and strike breakers.

Using this argument, it is also possible to explain why the Chinese were discriminated against at one time and not at another. At first the employers welcomed the Chinese as a source of cheap labour. In the 1880's the point was reached when the economic competition between the Chinese and the white workers was so intense that the more adventurous Chinese began to start enterprises of their own, challenging directly the white capitalists. The employers thus cooperated with the workers to boycott the Chinese.²⁹

O. Klinberg does not come to such an extreme conclusion but he argues that a discriminatory attitude is a cha-

27. G.B. Cressey, "The Anglo-Indians: a disorganized marginal group", Social Forces, Vol. 14, p. 1935, p. 263-268.

28. O.C. Cox, Class, Caste and Race: A Study of Social Dynamics, New York: Doubleday, 1948, p. 54.

29. O.C. Cox, op. cit.

racteristic of the economically deprived who are afraid of downward mobility.³⁰ When wave after wave of immigrants move in and as economic opportunities shrink, the vertical mobility of the immigrants arouses the fear of the poorer members of the dominant group. The Jews and the richer negroes are being discriminated against for the same reason. But it can be argued that economic competition is also present among the host members, yet it is hard to find any group among the members of the host country who are being discriminated for the economic competition they offer. This again suggests that race is an important element in discrimination and assimilation.

e. Education factor

There is no consensus as to how education affects assimilation. Some hold that education retards the rate of assimilation, others that education accelerates the rate of assimilation.

Davie³¹ finds that educated immigrants usually place greater demands on the receiving country than do the uneducated. Failing to achieve their expectations, the former is dissatisfied. Taft³² further adds that the lot of the ignorant is easier to bear because the 'more typical working class immigrants succumb with less protest to American

30. O. Klinberg, Characteristics of the American Negro, New York: Harper, 1944.

31. M.R. Davie, Refugees in America, New York: Harper, 1947, quoted in R. Johnston, Immigrant Assimilation, Perth: Paterson Brokensha, 1965, p.34.

32. D. Taft & R. Robbins, International Migration, New York: Ronald Press, 1955, p. 452.

materialism, after all, it has given them the rise in status they have sought.'

However in giving this explanation, they are introducing a third variable - social class. Hobart³³ finds that when social class is controlled, education appears to be the single most important variable affecting assimilation. This finding is the same as that of Roucek's study of the assimilation of the Lithuanians and the Hungarians in the United States.³⁴ Borrie ascribes the low rate of assimilation of the Italians in Australia to their lack of education.³⁵ It is argued that a person with a higher level of education has a better chance of comprehending the new culture. The professional and the educated have more cross-cultural contacts with host members in dispensing their services. Also the opportunities for intellectual discussions which they enjoy help to reduce the social distance between individuals. In these ways, education helps to increase the rate of assimilation.

f. Political factor

It is suggested that the policy of the receiving country is a factor which either constrains or strengthens the ability of the immigrant to assimilate. Simons³⁶ identifies two types of policy which resulted in two dif-

33. C.W. Hobart, op. cit., p. 571.

34. J.S. Roucek, "Lithuanian Immigrants in America" American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 1936, p. 447-453.

35. W.B. Borrie, op. cit.

36. S.E. Simons, "Social Assimilation", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 7, 1901, p. 386-404.

ferent rates of assimilation: the autocratic and the democratic type. The former encourages assimilation through coercive method in which 'attack is made by force and response is caused by fear; while the latter type is by the attractive method in which attack is made by influence and response caused by ambition.'³⁷ The American policy has been of the latter type. Based on the ideal of universal brotherhood, the democratic method allows equal opportunity and free participation in society as well as universal suffrage in politics. The autocratic type of assimilation is represented by Czarist Russia. It emphasised compulsion and persecution as well as censorship as a means of producing similarity of thought. Under such circumstances, it is found that the Europeans in Russia were hardly assimilated.

Though Simons seems to be biased in his analysis, there is no doubt that the attitude and policies of the receiving country can foster or hinder assimilation. The same logic runs through when racial and economic factors are used in explaining assimilation. Discrimination and segregation have direct effect on the opportunities the government of the host society provides for personal contact among the various groups through the school, work and other institutions of society. This point brings us to our next group of theorists who concentrate on the situation in which assimilation occurs.

³⁷. S.E. Simons, op. cit., p. 386-404.

2. Those concentrating on the situation in which assimilation occurs

This group of theorists concentrate on the particular situation in which group consciousness is strengthened or weakened. They hold that interaction on an equal basis in work, neighbourhood, social clubs as well as intermarriage will break down group consciousness and group solidarity, which have been perpetuated by discrimination, cultural and racial diversities, economic exploitation and jealousy.

Drake and Cayton in their work Black Metropolis³⁸ maintain that among the European minorities in the United States, contact with the dominant group member increases the rate of adoption of cultural patterns. On the other extreme, the American Indians in the reserves are the least assimilated because they have little contact with the Americans.

C.S. Johnson in "Economic Base of Race Relations"³⁹ and R.H. Lee on the "Decline of China Town in U.S.A."⁴⁰ show by various examples that integration in work and residence are conducive to the breakdown of group identification and thus quickens the rate of assimilation.

While agreeing in general that personal contact with

38. Drake St. Claire & H.R. Cayton, Black Metropolis, New York: Harper, 1962, p. 99f.

39. A. Locke and B.J. Stern, When Peoples Meet, Hines, Hayden & Eldridge, 1946, p. 570.

40. R.H. Lee, "The Decline of Chinatown in the U.S.A." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 54, 1949, p. 422-432.

members of the host country leads to assimilation, sociologists differ in the emphasis as to the particular situation in which these contacts will facilitate assimilation. Some suggest that it is contact in neighbourhood that leads to assimilation, others suggest it is the contact in social clubs and others, that interaction with the host members in the work situation is the most conducive to assimilation.

a. Interaction in neighbourhood

J.E. Mayer⁴¹ argues that in a segregated community, there is a tendency for people to preserve their culture, to in-marry and live a life separate from the larger society. Segregation in residence often means that the immigrants go to different schools, different recreation centers, different churches, that is segregation in residence leads to segregation in other aspects of life. Thus it is argued that dispersion in the pattern of residence among the members of the immigrant group quickens the rate of assimilation, whereas segregation in residential pattern increases group consciousness and retards the rate of assimilation.

Other sociologists such as Gillin⁴² indicate that segregation does not depend upon physical separation. Customs and traditions may erect barriers between groups

41. J.E. Mayer, Jewish Gentile Courtship, New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, p. 179.

42. L. Gillin, "Parallel Culture and the Inhibition to Acculturation", Social Forces, Vol. 24, 1945, p. 1-14.

which serve to isolate them as effectively as physical barriers. This is somewhat similar to Berry's distinction between spatial and social segregation.⁴³ Williams⁴⁴ further argues that if the rate of dispersion of the minorities is great, then this dispersion pattern arouses the fear of the host society which would cause the host members to move out and segregate themselves. Thus residential dispersion may not lead to integration.

Residential segregation may then be a result of the discriminatory attitude of the host society. Even if the immigrant is ready to mix with the host members, a negative attitude such as voluntary segregation on the part of the host discourages assimilation. But the very fact that the minority group is ready to forego the emotional and practical needs of living with one's own kind serves as an indication that group consciousness is weakening among the immigrants. While not disagreeing that interaction in neighbourhood may lead to a greater degree of assimilation, one can argue that interaction in one's neighbourhood is a consequence rather than a cause of assimilation.

43. B. Berry, op. cit., p. 271-80. Spatial segregation is the physical separation in residence, work, recreation, schools and church. The Indian reserve is an example. Social segregation is the avoidance of social contact although members of the minority and the dominant group may be living in the same neighbourhood, etc.

44. R.E. Williams, "The Reduction of Intergroup Tension", Social Science Bulletin, Vol. 57, 1947, p. 58.

b. Interaction in social clubs and intermarriage

Another view advanced is that assimilation will only take place when members of the minority are encouraged by the host members to join the social clubs and allow intermarriage with the dominant group.

R.E. Williams believes that the assimilation of the immigrant is facilitated by close personal contact and inhibited by minimum impersonal contact.⁴⁵ Migration of the negroes from the rural south to the northern cities of the United States increases the amount of contact, but the white restricts these contacts to impersonal ones as in lawcourts, employer-employee relations. Negroes are discouraged to participate in their recreation activities, or intermarry with the host members. Banton⁴⁶ argues that urbanization results in the separation of work and leisure. The whites **return** to their neighbourhood, to the kind of recreation they like and the type of people they like after their days' work. The negroes return to their own quarters. Distinct group consciousness continues to exist.

The argument puts forward by these sociologists suggests that assimilation will occur only when they are allowed equal participation in the private life of the dominant group, e.g. participating in their recreational

45. R.E. Williams, op. cit., p. 58.

46. M. Banton, The Coloured Quarter, London: Jonathan Cape, 1955, p. 68-69.

clubs. Intermarriage and the association in non-competitive situations as in these social clubs, it is argued, generate spontaneity of feeling between the host members and the immigrants. Individuals under these circumstances will tend to lose their group consciousness.

But the important question is: How is this stage reached? Interaction in recreational clubs being interaction on a spontaneous basis cannot be legislated. How is the initial barrier overcome? Willingness to interact in the realms of private life must come after the development of a certain amount of understanding between groups. It is the behavioral manifestation of the psychological process of assimilation, involving a change of attitudes. It is not a cause but an index of assimilation. What then is the first stage of assimilation? It is within those institutions where interaction is more structured and less voluntary, e.g. in schools, in the work situations that assimilation first takes place.

c. Interaction in work

Some sociologists hold that segregation in work strengthens group solidarity, conversely participation in work on equal basis quickens the rate of assimilation.

Coughlin⁴⁷ argues that it is usually the traders who are more assimilated than any other members of the immigrant group because they are directly involved in **work** relation-

47. R.J. Coughlin, Double Identity, The Chinese of Modern Thailand, London: Oxford University Press, 1960, p. 86-91.

ship with members of the host society. Further Shibutani⁴⁸ holds that artisans and professionals assimilate more quickly than other members because of the cross-cultural contact in dispensing their services.

Another type of contact is on a more structured basis. It has been argued that racial conflicts are often resolved in the modern industrial plants where negroes and whites work side by side.⁴⁹ There is a better feeling of brotherhood among the workers of both races. In these circumstances, work situation creates a sense of common goal and is conducive to the reduction of group consciousness on the part of the immigrants.

Critics of this view challenge the assumption that contact in the work situation leads to assimilation. Eisenstadt using reference group theory explains that an individual will identify more with a group if he finds that he can fulfil his goals by becoming a member of that group.⁵⁰ Beth⁵¹ also argues that in a society where upward mobility is encouraged, the more ambitious among the minority are eager to climb the social ladder. When upward mobility is denied them, the ambitious go into voluntary segregation, they spend their energy in getting high status within their own group, they are very group conscious since it

48. T. Shibutani, op. cit., p. 491-502.

49. A. Locke & B.J. Stern, op. cit., p. 722-723.

50. S.N. Eisenstadt, "Reference Group behavior and Social Integration", American Journal of Sociological Review, Vol. 19, 1954, p. 175-185.

51. M.W. Beth, "The Elite and the Elites", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 48, 1942, p. 746-755.

is only by identifying themselves with their own group that they have their sense of fulfilment. Where discrimination is present, the dominant group may go so far as to refuse to provide services to those being discriminated against and to refuse to use the services provided by these groups. Negroes in the United States practising, for example, teaching and medicine will serve their segregated community exclusively and have a clientele within their own ethnic group. This kind of practice will insulate them against competition from the American whites. These people are therefore ready to encourage segregation to protect their own interest.

Economic segregation operates in another way to retard assimilation. This is shown in the work of Warner and Srole.⁵² Their work points out that discrimination tends to keep the immigrants in more or less the same income group, living in the same type of neighbourhood, limiting their contact only to those of their own ethnic group, and hence reducing the possibility of assimilation.

Therefore in cases where discrimination is present, segregation whether voluntary or involuntary occurs, group solidarity will be increased. But when discrimination is absent and the immigrants are dispersed among the host members, the rate of assimilation will be accelerated.

52. W.L. Warner and L. Srole, op. cit., p.220.

The preceding examination of the review of literature on the determinants of assimilation reveals that it is impossible to identify any one factor which brings about increased assimilation. Theories using cultural, racial or geographic factors to explain why assimilation occurs have been invalidated by counter examples. For instance, racial visibility explains the lack of assimilation among the Negroes, but fails to explain why skin colour does not seem to have any effect in the assimilation of the immigrants in Hawaii. The length of residence and political factor explains some variation in the assimilation of immigrants but fail to explain others. For example, while it is true that those who stay longer in the host country are usually more assimilated, there are considerable differences in the rate of assimilation among different groups who have been in the host country for the same length of time.

The multi-causal approach has an advantage over the monist one. Sociologists using the former approach name a whole list of factors which explain adequately assimilation in one situation. But in taking such an approach one cannot apply it to any other situations. While not denying the logic of this approach, I feel that it is more fruitful to arrive at a valid hypothesis with a

certain degree of generalizability.

I tend to agree with sociologists who emphasise the social situations in which assimilation occurs. This approach gives some unity to the diversity of the causes of assimilation. The different opportunities for interaction provided by these situations as the work situation, political institutions or social clubs or the length of stay explain the different rates of assimilation. Thus assimilation is easier in a society where an immigrant can participate on an equal basis in all the institutions than in one where he is segregated from the host members. A work situation where an immigrant works side by side with the host members is more conducive to assimilation than in one where the immigrants feel that they are being discriminated or segregated from the host members. The length of stay in the host country affects assimilation because a longer length of stay in the host country means more contact with the host members.

THE HYPOTHESES

My hypothesis is that the opportunities for interaction between the immigrants and the host members; and the attitude of the host members as perceived by the immigrants during these interactions are the major factors which aid or retard assimilation.

How is it that interaction affects assimilation? This is because assimilation as pointed out in the previous

section involves the identification of the immigrant with the host society, adopting their cultural traits and behavioral patterns and sharing experiences in the same occupation or social clubs. These aspects necessitate role learning - learning who he is, what kind of person he is, and how to play his part in the society. This definition of his role as a member of the host society is incorporated in his sense of self. He learns to define his role through interaction, from the reactions of the people towards him. From the behavior of the host members, he learns to assess his behavior, he knows what is expected from him and these experiences serve as guides to his future behavior. If these indicators prove to be correct on many occasions, the behavior will become an established one. So the frequency of contact can reinforce a person's behavior.

The definition of one's role as a member of the host society is learnt from the response of the others to one's behavior. This is part of social learning, that is, the prevailing values and norms of a society provides the frame of reference for a person to make his judgment. If discrimination is the norm of the society, if the person feels that he is continually treated differently or avoided by members of a group visibly distinguished from himself on racial or cultural grounds, he will feel that he is different from members of that group. Or if in learning the various roles, the person is able to evoke reward and

equal treatment by imitating the members of the group, his sense of identification as a member of that group is reinforced, he will feel that he is accepted as a member of that group. Therefore a person's definition of his role as a member of the host society depends on two factors - the frequency of the interaction, the attitude of the host members as perceived by the immigrants during these interactions.

It can be safely assumed that frequent contacts with the host members together with a feeling of being equally treated will increase the rate of assimilation. When the contact is limited and the immigrant is very conscious of being discriminated against, the rate of assimilation will be low. But in the case of an acute sense of discrimination, will the frequency of interaction counteract this adverse effect? Or what will the degree of assimilation be when the immigrant has little contact with the host and has little feeling of being discriminated against? These are some of the questions which this present study aims at investigating.

In this study, the relationship between education and assimilation is being investigated. This is because the education system of a country has always been regarded as an agency for socialization and reflects the norms of a society. It is a system meant for the social continuity of life. It reflects the beliefs, ideals, hopes and

practices of the dominant group in the society. And these norms are transmitted through the interaction with the teachers and the students. But the relationship between education and assimilation has often been overlooked. Even when it is being studied, the level of education is regarded as the only way in which education can affect the degree of a person's assimilation, no study has attempted to explain in what ways education may affect assimilation.

It is therefore postulated that the interaction of the immigrant with the host members within the education system increases the degree of assimilation, so an immigrant educated in Canada will be more assimilated than another with no education in Canada. Depending on the perception of the immigrant of the presence of discrimination, the degree of assimilation will differ. The following hypothesis are formed, it is postulated that:

1. there will be a positive relationship between the level of education and the score on the assimilation scale.
2. there will be a positive relationship between the amount of education received in the host country and the score on the assimilation scale.
3. there will be a negative relationship between the presence of discrimination and the score on the assimilation scale.

4. there will be no relationship between the degree of assimilation and the country in which immigrants received their education when the level of education and discrimination are controlled.

SUMMARY

In this chapter I have examined first the concept of assimilation and tried to distinguish it from the concepts of integration and acculturation. It is decided that a person is assimilated when he sees himself as a member of the host society, adopts the cultural patterns and participates in its institutions on equal basis. Assimilation is composed of three aspects - cultural assimilation, integration assimilation and identification assimilation. Three types of assimilation are identified - Anglo-conformity, melting pot theory and cultural pluralism. The assimilation of immigrants in Canada belongs to the last one.

Then the literature on the factors contributing to assimilation is reviewed. Sociologists trying to explain the causes of assimilation fall into two groups - multi-causal theorists and monist theorists. The monist theorists are subdivided into those who suggest to explain assimilation by different factors and those who use the situational approach. The different factors put forward to explain the assimilation of immigrants prove to be unsatisfactory. Though the multi-causal approach of

explaining the different rate of assimilation by a number of factors is more valuable in accounting for the assimilation of immigrants, it has no power of generalization. My hypothesis is that interaction between the immigrants and the host members in all sphere of life can accelerate the rate of assimilation. But assimilation will be slower for those who feel discriminated against and faster for those who do not feel discriminated against. In this particular study, the relationship between assimilation and education will be investigated.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This study as pointed out in Chapter 1 is part of the Alberta Migration Project carried out by Dr. F. Sukdeo on post-war migration in Alberta. This project aimed at investigating: (1) the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the immigrant population, (2) the role and adjustment of these immigrants, (3) the rate of absorption of immigrants in Alberta in comparison with the rest of Canada, and (4) the historical trends of immigration in Alberta in terms of demographic and economic growth. This present study however is only concerned with the assimilation of the immigrants and how their education affects their rate of assimilation.

The first section of the chapter deals with the sampling design, the drafting of the questionnaire, the interviewing and coding in the Alberta Migration Project; the next section deals with the construction of the assimilation scale and the methods of data analysis for the present study.

THE ALBERTA MIGRATION PROJECT

One of the distinguishing feature of this project was the division of tasks among the various specialists. Dr. Ivan Fellegi, Director of the Sampling and Survey Section of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was responsible for

the sampling design. The York University Survey Research Centre took charge of the listing¹ and interviewing. And Dr. F. Sukdeo was the chief investigator who designed and organized the project. The author of this thesis followed through every stage of the project and assisted in the pretest and the coding.

Sampling

The population of Edmonton and Calgary was the universe under study. The two cities were chosen because the immigrants and migrants to Alberta in the postwar years tended to move mainly into these metropolitan areas. About 132,000 out of 289,000 of the foreign-born population in Alberta were found in these two cities in 1961, that is, over 40% of the immigrants could be located in these two cities.²

The population studied was divided into three groups:

- a. Immigrants, as defined in this study were people who moved into Canada after 1946 and were residing in these two cities.
- b. Migrants, as defined in the study were residents of Canadian origin, born outside Alberta but came to Alberta since 1946.
- c. Albertans were Canadians born in Alberta.

1. For details see p. 49.

2. W.E. Kalbach, The Impact of Immigration on Canada's Population, Ottawa: D.B.S., 1970, p.91.

Since the proportion of the postwar immigrants was only about 15% of the population, a self-weighting sample (i.e. a sample in which each household has the same chance of selection) would have yielded too few immigrants in the sample. To give a higher sampling ratio to the strata in which the proportion of the postwar immigrants was high would increase the sampling error. Therefore a two-phased disproportional stratified sampling design was used whereby a larger first phase sample was selected and all the immigrants identified were retained to be interviewed and the Albertans and migrants appropriately subsampled.

In the first phase, enumeration areas which were geographically close together and in addition, had similar concentration of immigrants were grouped together to form a stratum. Eighteen strata were formed in Edmonton and seventeen in Calgary. Listers were sent out to put down on the listing-sheets provided, the street number, the house number and details for each dwelling. This was done in November 1970. One occupant of each household was interviewed (First Phase Interviewing). Out of a total of 3066 households selected, 2740 responded, i.e. about 90% response rate. In the first phase, these respondents were identified as immigrants, migrants or Albertans. All the immigrants were kept for second phase interviewing, while the

Albertans and the migrants were subsampled. A total of 963 respondents were chosen for Phase Two Interviewing. Of these 427 were immigrants, 397 migrants and 139 Albertans. The breakdown of the sample appears in the following table.

TABLE III-1: DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE BY RESIDENCE
AND COMPOSITION

	Postwar Immigrants	Postwar Migrants	Albertans	Total
Calgary	221	205	63	489
Edmonton	206	192	76	474
Total	427	397	139	963

The drafting of the Questionnaire

Two questionnaires were prepared, one for Phase I Interviewing, another for Phase II Interviewing. The purpose of Phase I Interviewing was to identify the respondents as postwar immigrants, migrants or Albertans. Only questions relating to the place of birth of the head of the household, and if they were non-Albertans, year of their arrival into Canada or Alberta were included in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire used in Phase II Interviewing was the main one. It aimed at providing information on the following topics:

1. the push and pull factors of migration, the reasons

for choosing Alberta, out-migration motivation, source of information on Alberta.

2. demographic characteristics of the respondents as place of birth, age, marital status, education level, family composition.

3. adjustment problems as experienced in settling down on arrival, participation in community activities, language problems, nostalgia for old country, citizenship motivation.

4. socio-economic characteristics as income, housing conditions, property ownership, economic and social mobility.

The questions included in the questionnaire consisted of both closed and open-ended ones. Three pretests were carried out during a period of three months, improvements were made from the suggestions of the interviewers based on their interviewing experience and the questionnaire was considerably refined in the final survey. A complete list of the questions included is given in Appendix A.

Interviewing

People who had worked on similar projects were recruited as interviewers. Training sessions to acquaint them with the basic techniques of interviewing were held for them. The interview was structured, that is the questions were asked as they appeared on the questionnaire. It was also non-directive, that is, an interviewer did not force a respondent into a statement that he did not volunteer. In the case of misunderstanding, the question

was repeated. Probes were avoided as much as possible. When it was absolutely necessary, set forms of words were to be used, e.g. 'Anything else?', 'How do you mean?'. For open-ended questions, all responses were recorded verbatim. For close-ended questions, the alternatives chosen by the respondents were checked. The interviewing began in January 1971 and was completed by the end of February of the same year.

About 86% of the interviews were completed within three calls. If no one answered on the first call, the interviewer usually called back at another time of the next day. As a result a response rate of over 90% was reached.

Coding

The development of the coding manual began at the time of the pretest in November 1970. Just as the questionnaire was improved with the pretest experience, the coding manual was improved with the light of the pretest response rate.

Questions requiring numerical answers as age, years of education were coded exactly as the information given. These numbers were not grouped into categories because the job could have been done by the computer more quickly and more accurately. The codes for the open-ended questions were not compiled until the first fifty questionnaires were returned. Codes were drawn up using the frequency of

the answers as a guide. The eight most frequent responses to each question were selected with a ninth code, 'other', for the residual answers not included in the eight categories.

After the coding manual was prepared and the questionnaires were ready for coding, it was decided to write the codes directly besides the questions. At the end of the questions pertaining to one card, coders wrote the number of the next card in bold blue before proceeding to the next code. The questionnaires were then sent to the keypuncher to be punched and the data processed from IBM cards.

THE MEASUREMENT OF ASSIMILATION

Multiple Indices of Assimilation

Before any analysis can be carried out, a scale has to be found to measure an immigrant's degree of assimilation. Attempts have been made to study assimilation by means of projective techniques such as the use of ink blots, photographs and others, or by means of attitude tests as the Roscharch Scale and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale or by analysing the literary production of the social group under study.³ But assimilation as pointed out before is a complex concept

3. An example is W.O. Brown, "Nature of Race Consciousness", Social Forces, Vol. 10, 1931, p. 91-99.

involving the three dimensions used in the study - cultural, integration and psychological assimilation. Any technique which measures just one aspect of assimilation is not a good measure, as far as studying assimilation is concerned. A composite measure indicating the different aspects should be used.

Also in sociological research, the mere presence of the interviewers and the use of questionnaires can result in respondents giving what they consider to be an acceptable answer, a common enough experience but possibly more marked in areas dealing with ethnic relations. It has also been shown by La Piere⁴ that a person may not act according to his professed attitude when the structure of the situation changes. In his study of discrimination of the Chinese in America, he found that even though the hotel management claimed that they would not accept Chinese as clients yet they did serve all clients without ethnic discrimination when faced with a certain situation. Therefore in studying the concept of assimilation, questions pertaining both to attitudes and behavior were asked with information gathered in one area being used as a check on the information gathered in another.

Cultural assimilation

The use of English as a medium of communication in the everyday life of an immigrant was used as a measure

4. R. La Piere, "Attitudes vs Actions", Social Forces, Vol. 13, 1934, p. 230-237.

of cultural assimilation. The justification for this choice is given below.

The cultural aspects of assimilation are the most difficult to investigate, because cultural features are not definite enough to be tested. Some aspects of culture may be more easily taken over than others, for example, the use of technology. Other features may be retained even though the immigrant identifies with the host country, for example, food habits. What aspects are adopted by the immigrants vary in time and with the ethnic group concerned. But cultural assimilation involves not only the behavioral changes but changes in attitudes and values. It is most difficult to say the adoption of which attitude is the more useful index of cultural assimilation.

However this difficulty is avoided in developing an assimilation scale for a culturally pluralistic society such as Canada. The policy of the Canadian government is one of cultural pluralism, that is, the ethnic minorities are encouraged to maintain the continuance of their cultural tradition so long as it does not interfere with fulfilling their responsibilities to the society. The government is only concerned with the economic and social integration of the immigrants ⁵ while a laissez-faire attitude is adopted in the sphere of cultural assimilation.

5. W.D. Borrie, op. cit., p. 2.

As a result, retaining of certain aspects of one's culture such as religion is not an indication that a person is unassimilated in the Canadian society.

Language behavior , that is, the use of English by the immigrant in his daily activities was used as an index of assimilation. It was felt that a person can retain many aspects of his own culture without hindering his assimilation, yet language is an essential element of assimilation. Isaac has pointed out that a common language as a means of communication is an urgent necessity in the formation of a new state like Israel. Without Hebrew as the common language it was impossible to attain the degree of cohesion essential for the formation of an independent nation state.⁶

This is because language is not just some meaningless symbols, it is a system of defined and meaningful verbal forms which is the medium of social relations.⁷ It is a means of communication, a tool which enables the immigrant to become acquainted with the host society. Borrie⁸ emphasises the 'ability to converse in a common language is the essential first step in the integration of the immigrants..... Without the necessary linguistic knowledge immigrants can understand neither their rights nor

6. J. Isaac, "Israel - A New Melting Pot" in W.D. Borrie, op. cit., p. 254.

7. W.L. Warner & L. Srole, Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945, p. 220.

8. W.D. Borrie, op. cit., p. 43.

their duties.' To be able to use the language of the host society in one's daily life is therefore necessary for undisturbed communication in the new surroundings.

However to maintain that the external ability to converse, to read or write in the language of the host is synonymous with assimilation is to imply that a behavioral change is necessarily accompanied by a deeper attitudinal change. The sharing of a common speech does not guarantee participation in or identification with the host society. However language behavior especially speaking the host language at home can be regarded as a sign or rough index of assimilation.

Integration assimilation

Integration assimilation involves participation by immigrants in the various institutions of the host society. In this study, participation in work and institutions such as clubs, etc. was taken as an index of integration assimilation.

Borrie⁹ suggests that full participation in the work situation is the dominant variable in the assimilation process. The work situation is the most basic institution through which the immigrants earn their daily bread and make contacts with members of the host country. Shibutani holds that among the intellectuals and the professionals there are more opportunities for cross-cultural

9. W.D. Borrie, op. cit. p. 99-115.

cooperation in dispensing their services and this will tend to reduce the social distance and increase the understanding between the immigrant and the host members. The same conclusion is reached by Reynolds in his study of the British in Canada.¹⁰ The labouring class on the other hand are constrained by their income to live in social and cultural isolation; they are too engrossed in the struggle for existence to participate in the social and cultural activities of the host society. So it is safe to assume that a person of a higher socio-economic status would usually be more assimilated than his counterpart on a lower socio-economic level.

But as Hobart's findings indicate, a high socio-economic status of an immigrant does not always indicate a high degree of assimilation.¹¹ In his study of the Ukrainians in Canada he finds that those with a high economic status are less satisfied with their economic conditions. He explains this by the theory of relative deprivation. The level of satisfaction a person experiences depends on the criterion the person chooses to measure his present condition. This is especially so with an educated person who feels that he is earning less than he should or that he is unable to utilize his skill in his new environment. This is likely to result in an embitterment which will lead him to reject the Canadian society and reduce

10. T. Shibutani, op. cit.; L.G. Reynolds, op. cit.

11. C.W. Hobart, op. cit., p. 569-570.

the possibility of assimilation. Therefore in looking into the economic aspect of integration assimilation, one needs again to consider both the behavioral and attitudinal aspect.

Other sociologists regard social integration as the first stage of assimilation. Saenger¹² asserts that social contacts are necessary to acquaint the newcomer with the customs and manners of the host country, it is a 'first stage of Americanization'. The same opinion is expressed by Berry¹³. Informal contact is important as a sign of assimilation. Eisenstadt¹⁴ also feels that social interaction on a voluntary basis is a better indication of assimilation than in a structured organization, where the individual is forced into interaction whether he likes it or not. Interaction on a social basis is an expression of friendship or common interest and understanding. A person with friends or spouse of the host country is more likely to have acquired some of the attitudes of the host members.

However Saenger¹⁵ issues a warning about using social contact as an index of total assimilation. It is because continuous contact may lead only to external assimilation (i.e. a change in behavior only) as when an immigrant continues the social contact but does not necessarily approve

12. G. Saenger, op. cit., p. 166

13. B. Berry, Race Relations, Boston: Houghton, 1951, p.246f.

14. S.N. Eisenstadt, op. cit., p. 175-185.

15. G. Saenger, op. cit., p. 166.

of it. He may pursue it from a lack of better alternative. The punishment of social isolation is so severe that any contact is better than none. The same rationale may lie behind intermarriage. An immigrant may marry outside his own group because of the acute lack of partners of his own ethnic group. A person who marries outside his own group out of expediency should not be ranked the same in his assimilation score as a person who marries out of a commonality of interests or attitudes. It is only by attempting to identify both the behavioral and psychological aspects that such differentiation can be made.

Another indication of assimilation can be seen from the immigrant's opinion of the host country and the problems he encountered on arrival. De Groot¹⁶ finds a correlation of 0.85 between favourable opinions about the host country and the degree of assimilation. Kent¹⁷ stresses especially the role of the first impression of the host country in the assimilation of immigrants. It can be safely assumed that a person who is satisfied with the conditions in the host country and feels that he has no problems in adjusting himself to the new environment is more assimilated than a dissatisfied person.

16. D.E. de Groot, The Assimilation of Postwar Immigrants In Atlanta, Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Ohio State University, 1957, quoted in R. Johnston, Immigrant Assimilation, Perth: Paterson Brokensha Pty. Ltd., 1965, p. 41.

17. D.P. Kent, The Refugee Intellectual, New York: Columbia University Press, 1953, p. 5.

Identification Assimilation

Identification assimilation occurs when an immigrant identifies himself as a member of the host society. It is an important element of assimilation because it distinguishes assimilation from acculturation and integration per se. In this study two indices of identification assimilation are used - identification with the host society and with one's ethnic group.

Naturalisation is taken as a measure of identification with the Canadian society. It is a procedure which officially acknowledges a change from one nationality to another. Kent¹⁸ regards it as the burning of a bridge from which there is no turning back. By giving up his former citizenship, the naturalised immigrant demonstrates to the others that he has ceased to be an alien and is a Canadian. Naturalisation can therefore be taken as an external index of assimilation.

Brown however expresses rather skeptical opinion about naturalisation. The legalistic procedure 'does not transform overnight the complicated social attitude of the newly certified American citizen.'¹⁹ Borrie also says that naturalisation means 'little more than a step which has to be taken, for example, to secure a commercial fisherman's license or to

18. D.P. Kent, op. cit., p. 24-25.

19. F.J. Brown & J.S. Roucek, One America, New York: Prentice Hall, 1945, p. 415.

raise money to acquire a farm in order to lay a basis of economic security.'²⁰ Again one has to look into the motivations underlying naturalisation. Does it arise out of a sense of belonging? Is it motivated by such reasons as securing the right type of occupation and social service benefits?

Another measure to countercheck the validity of an immigrant's identification assimilation is to look into his desires to associate with people of his own ethnic group. If the desire to naturalise arises out of a feeling of identification with Canada, then the desire of this immigrant to mix with his ethnic group might be less strong than that of another who does not identify with Canada. He will be less conscious of the ethnic origin of the persons with whom he interacts.

So in attempting to assess the degree of identification of the immigrants with the Canadian society, naturalisation is taken as the measure. Whatever the motive, non-acceptance of Canadian citizenship might be an index of non-assimilation. Even when one probes into the motivation of the immigrant one may not get at his real attitude on such a delicate subject as the reason for naturalisation. A countercheck was therefore used in this study and this was the person's desire to associate with his own ethnic group.

20. W.D. Borrie, Italians and Germans in Australia, Melbourne: Cheshire, 1954, p. 15.

Construction of the Assimilation Scale

Based on the above considerations, the scale of assimilation included as far as possible, both the behavioral and attitudinal indices of cultural assimilation, integration assimilation and identification assimilation. The areas included are indicated below.

TABLE III-2: ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ASSIMILATION SCALE

	Cultural assimilation	Integration assimilation	Identification assimilation
Behavioral	Language used in daily life	Participation in social ins- titutions of host society	Country of citizenship
Attitudinal		Satisfaction with life in host country	Reasons for applying ci- tizenship
		Feeling of difficulties in adjusting to new sur- roundings	Preference for own eth- nic group

A total of some forty questions were chosen relating to these various aspects. These questions were taken from the questionnaire given to the immigrants in a study carried out by Dr. F. Sukdeo in the spring of 1971.²¹ At the initial stage, a number of questions were discarded because of the lack of variation in the answers given. For example, with the question, 'What ethnic group do you belong to?', only

²¹. For details of the questionnaire, see Appendix A, p. 120.

2.6% of the respondents answered Canadian. While the answer to this question might have been a good indication of identification assimilation, it had to be left out because of this lack of variance. A similar difficulty arose with the questions, 'What place do you now consider to be your home?', only 4.7% mentioned a place outside Canada.

The second stage was to recode the answers. One point was given to an answer which indicated a high degree of assimilation and zero was given to those who indicated a low degree of assimilation. For example, 'At such(federal, provincial or municipal) election, would you prefer to vote for a person of your own ethnic group?', a respondent who answered yes would mean that he was partial to a member of his own ethnic group, indicating that he still identified with his own ethnic group. As a result he would score zero for that question, a negative answer to the question would score one.

In incorporating questions into an index of assimilation, some of the questions had to be combined or matched against each other. For example, no question specifically on intermarriage could be found. So the question on the ethnic origin of the respondent was matched against the question on the ethnic origin of the spouse. When the ethnic origin of the spouse was found to be different from that of the respondent, then one point was given to the respondent. If both were of the same ethnic group, then no point would be scored.

After recoding, thirty items were chosen as indices of assimilation. The next stage was to look for any underlying relationship among these variables chosen and to see if these indices could be reduced to a smaller set of factors or components. Factor analysis was chosen because of its data-reducing property. It also acts as a validity and reliability check of the instrument measuring assimilation.²² Factor analysis consists of three stages: 1) the preparation of the correlation matrix to calculate the appropriate measure of association for a set of variables. 2) the combination of the variables into a new set of variables or factors which explain the variation in the indices used. 3) the factors are rotated to find indices which are highly correlated with a given cluster of variables but uncorrelated with those indices belonging to other clusters.

The result of the factor analysis showed that there were six factors which were most useful as indices of assimilation. Based on this statistical consideration along with the arguments previously advanced a scale of assimilation was finally arrived at. (See Table III-3) Cultural assimilation was indicated by a person's language behavior, at home and at work. Integration assimilation was indicated by the immigrant's difficulties in adjusting to the Cana-

22. Validity is the extent to which the instrument measures what it intends to measure. Invalid instrument would yield systematic error. Reliability is the extent to which repeated measures would yield the same result. Variations in measurement represent random error. The correlation among the large number of items used in the factor analysis is a reliability and validity check.

TABLE III-3: COMPONENTS OF THE ASSIMILATION SCALE²³

	Assimilation	Behavioral	Attitudinal
C U L T U R A L	1. Language Behavior	a. language used by respondent with spouse b. language used by respondent with children c. language used by children to respondent d. language used at work	e. perception of language difficulty in daily life when mother tongue is not English
I N T E G R A T I O N	2. Social Integration	a. ethnic origin of friends b. ethnic origin of clientele of church attended c. intermarriage	
	3. Economic Integration	a. total income per year	b. fulfilment of job plan c. opinion on own standard of living
	4. Initial Problems of Adjustment		a. job problem b. problem on way of life c. loneliness
I D E N T I F I C A T I O N	5. Identification with Canada	a. country of citizenship	b. desire to apply Canadian citizenship
	6. Ethnic Identification		a. preference to live in area of own ethnic group b. preference of candidate of own ethnic group

23. For the questions included in the assimilation scale, see Appendix B, p. 147.

dian way of life and his social and economic integration. Identification assimilation was indicated by a person's nationality, intention to apply for Canadian citizenship, and his consciousness of his ethnicity. Items indicating the behavioral and attitudinal aspects were sometimes included in one subscale. Since the general outline of the scale still coincided generally with the framework arrived at from theoretical analysis, it is safe to assume that a person who scores low on this scale will be less assimilated than one who scores higher on the scale.

THE METHODS OF ANALYSIS

In the previous section, the construction of the scale of assimilation was described. In this section, the procedures used to investigate the relationship between education and assimilation were given.

Cross-tabulations were used to test the tenability of the hypotheses postulated in Chapter 2. A cross-tabulation is a contingency table showing the joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables. The presence of a relationship between variables and its direction were detected from the display of the distribution of cases by their position on two or more variables.

The statistics to test the significance of a relationship had to be used with much caution since most of the

statistics required the assumption of independence. For the present study, cluster sampling was used at one stage, the data violated the assumption of random sampling, these statistics could not be used. So by a rule of thumb, a difference of 10% or more was taken as a significant relationship.

The review of literature had shown that a host of factors had been suggested to explain assimilation. Recognising the complexity of the concept of assimilation, and as a further test of the tenability of the hypothesis, a number of controls was used: ethnic origin of the respondents, age at the time of arrival into Canada and the year of arrival into the country. If the original relationship was maintained with the addition of these variables, then the relationship became more tenable. However the frequency distribution in the individual cells would sometimes be too small if these controls were applied simultaneously, so all controls could not be applied in some cases.

Even when the frequency distribution permitted the use of these controls simultaneously, it would yield 32 partial tables (since each of these controls had two categories). Inspection of these 32 tables revealed rather confusing and ambiguous results, because there was considerable variation among the partial tables. It was difficult to determine whether these partial associations revealed a trend, and if such a trend existed, how one might express

it precisely. Therefore the method of test factor standardization was introduced.²⁴ Standardization provided a summary measure of what frequency distribution would be if certain population characteristics were held constant.

Dependent variables

The dependent variable was assimilation. The scale of assimilation was subdivided into subscales - language behavior, social integration, economic integration, adjustment problems, ethnic identification and identification with the host country. These subscales were dichotomised at the median into two groups: those having high assimilation score and those with a low score.

Independent variables

The level of education of a respondent was one of the independent variables under study and the years of formal education was used to measure the person's educational attainment. Quantity instead of quality was used as the criterion because standardization on the base of quality was impracticable. Vocational education in Canada was considered equivalent to a high school education but in developing countries as those in Southeast Asia, technical schools belonged to post-secondary education. If the level of education was trichotomised as a sort of compromise into those with high school education or below, vocational edu-

24. M. Rosenberg, "Test factor standardization as a method of interpretation", in D.P. Forcese and S. Richer ed., Stages of Social Research Comparative Perspectives, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970, p. 261-273.

cation and university degree, the number falling into each category would have been drastically reduced and would have further increased the difficulty when the controls were to be applied. As a result, the years of education was used as an indication of a person's education level and the cut point was made at the median (11.3 years).

Another independent variable was the place where the person obtained his education. The respondents were divided into two groups, those who had some education and those who had no education in Canada. This variable was chosen on the assumption that a person who had education in Canada would have more opportunities for interaction with members of the host country than a person with similar educational achievement but had all his education outside Canada.

Ethnic discrimination was the differential treatment accorded to a person based on his ethnicity. This was assessed by a person's perception of the attitude of the host members towards him. Two questions were used:

a) In your opinion, is there any ethnic discrimination in Alberta?

b) Have you personally experienced ethnic discrimination?

These two questions were correlated with each other and the correlation was as high as .36. The respondents were divided into two groups: those who were unaware of discrim-

ination and those who were aware of the presence of discrimination in Canada.

Control variables

Ethnic origin of the respondents, year of arrival into Canada and the age at the time of arrival were chosen as the control variables because previous researchers had shown that these three variables were strong contributory factors to assimilation.²⁵

Immigrants were divided into four groups based on their cultural similarity: the British and the Americans (henceforth known as Britus), the Western European (French, Dutch, Belgians, Portuguese, etc.), the Eastern European (Polish, Hungarians, Austrians, Czechoslovakians, etc.) and the immigrants from the "third world" countries (consisting of immigrants from West Indies, Asia and Africa, etc.) It cannot be said that there is a homogeneity in the culture of the fourth group, but it can be claimed that they are the coloured group whose cultures are more different from the Canadian one than those of the other three groups.

The year of arrival in Canada was taken as a control variable because it was assumed that those who stayed in Canada longer were more assimilated. Respondents were divided into two groups depending on their years of residence in Canada. The year 1962 was chosen as the cutoff point

25. See Chapter 2 on the theoretical justification.

for the year of arrival into Canada. It was in this year that admission of the immigrants into Canada based on cultural compatibility was removed and replaced by the criteria of educational qualification and skill. It was suspected that there would be some difference in the characteristics of the immigrants coming in these two periods.

The immigrants' age on arrival in Canada was chosen, previous studies had shown that age was a factor in assimilation. Young immigrants assimilate more easily than old ones. The former finds it easier to shed their cultural heritage. De Groot in the study of the various nationalities of immigrants in Atlanta finds that age cuts across national and religious differences. Whatever the nationality or religion, the young immigrants assimilate better than their older counterparts.²⁶ The immigrants in this study were therefore controlled for age and divided into two groups, those arriving at the age of twenty one or before and those arriving at twenty two or after.²⁷

SUMMARY

In the first part of the chapter, a description of the research project was given - the sampling procedure,

26. D.E. De Groot, op. cit., p. 30

27. See Appendix C for the questions used as independent and control variables.

the drafting of the questionnaire, interviewing and coding. In the next section, the procedures for constructing the assimilation scale were given. A number of variables associated with different aspects of assimilation were included and the validity of the choice of the questions based on theoretical consideration was tested by factor analysis. A scale of assimilation was arrived at. The last section dealt with the methodology used in testing the hypotheses. Cross-tabulations were used to detect the presence of any significant relationship. A list of dependent, independent and control variables was given.

Chapter 4

Findings

In this chapter, the findings based on efforts to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter 2 are reported.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a positive relationship between the level of education and the score on the assimilation scale.

In testing the relationship between education and assimilation, it is found that immigrants with a high level of education score more highly on the assimilation scale. As seen in Table IV-1, the relationship holds when a) the ethnic origin of the respondents and their age of arrival and b) the ethnic origin of the respondents and their year of arrival into Canada are controlled. In Table IV-1a, for example, about 43% of those with high education get a low score on the summary measure of assimilation as compared to nearly 56% of those with a low education (with 11 or less years of education).

This finding is further substantiated when one looks at the subscales individually. Immigrants with a higher level of education are more likely to have higher scores on the social integration subscale, that is, they tend to marry outside their own ethnic group more often and to have more Canadian friends than those with a lower

level of education. In column b of Table IV-1, there is a significant difference of 19% in the score on the social integration scale between those with a high level of education and those with a low education level. A difference of 15% also exists between those with a high and those with a low level of education on their scores on the economic integration scale in column b. This indicates that a person with a high education tends to earn more and to be more satisfied with his living standard than one with a low education level. The percentage differences for the other subscales are not as significant (i.e. they fall below the 10% difference level set), but they reveal a tendency in the same direction. Those with a high level of education tend to use English more often in their daily life, to have had fewer problems of adjustment, to identify less with their own ethnic group than those with a lower level of education. There is, however a weak indication that those with high level of education identify less with Canadians.

When one looks at each ethnic group individually in Table IV-2 and IV-3, this overall finding still holds in most cases. The general tendency still persists for immigrants with a high level of education to score higher on the assimilation scale than their counterparts with a low education level though there are a few exceptions to this general findings.

There is a general reversal of this trend among the immigrants from the 'third world countries'(i.e. countries

TABLE IV-1: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON ETHNIC ORIGIN AND (a) AGE OF ARRIVAL, (b) YEAR OF ARRIVAL INTO CANADA OF THE RESPONDENTS

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage Who Scored Low On Assimilation Scale ¹			
	(a)		(b)	
	Standardized on ethnic origin and age of arrival in Canada		Standardized on ethnic origin and year of arrival in Canada	
	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education
Summary Scale	55.80	42.85	58.47	42.34
Language Behavior	40.46	37.11	41.54	37.34
Social Integration	67.55	53.46	69.51	50.48
Economic Integration	58.39	42.69	60.16	45.97
Problems of Adjustment	53.20	47.56	54.32	48.80
Ethnic Identification	61.35	56.80	63.59	55.51
Identification with Canada	43.74	50.37	49.17	46.43
Total number of Respondents=427	111	309	295	132

of Asia, Africa and South America). Among them we find that those with a higher level of education have lower summary scores on the assimilation scale. This result is produced by the strong negative relationship between the level of education and the last subscale identification with Canada, that is, the more educated are less likely to become citizens. Strong negative relationship between the

1. The Britus group is excluded in subscale on language behavior, hence they tend to score lower on the summary scale than the other groups. While this is not an accurate estimate of the percentage who score low on the assimilation summary scale, it is a rough indication of the direction of the relationship.

level of education and the subscales problems of adjustment and ethnic identification is found only in Table IV-3 but disappears when the year of arrival into Canada is controlled, suggesting that besides the level of education, the length of stay is also an important variable affecting an immigrant's degree of assimilation. The cultural difference between Canada and the 'third world countries' together with further socialization to which education contributes therefore partly explains why the more educated immigrants from the 'third world countries' tend to have more problems of adjustment on their arrival, are less willing to mix with Canadians or to apply for Canadian citizenship. Persons with high level of education are probably more socialized into the culture of their home countries than their counterparts with low education level, hence highly educated immigrants coming from countries with cultures very different from Canada find it harder to adjust to the new surroundings or identify with Canada. The same factor partly explains why Western Europeans with **higher** education find more problems in adjusting to the Canadian way of life than their counterparts with lower education. Negative relationship is also found between the level of education and identification assimilation of the British and the Americans. This reluctance of the British and the Americans to adopt Canadian citizenship may be a function of their feeling of superiority and the privileged posi-

TABLE IV-2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION
AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON THE YEAR OF ARRIVAL
INTO CANADA

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of Respondents with Low Score on the Assimilation Scale							
	Britus		West		East		Third World	
	<u>Education</u>		<u>European</u>		<u>European</u>		<u>Education</u>	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Summary Scale	89.5	76.1	38.0	20.0	46.0	23.4	67.4	77.9
Language ² Behavior	—	—	22.6	24.8	44.1	35.6	75.0	72.7
Social Integration	58.7	41.2	72.6	56.4	73.1	52.6	78.7	54.9
Economic Integration	68.7	37.3	54.4	52.5	54.8	49.3	71.0	42.3
Problems of Adjustment	52.6	51.2	50.4	61.4	54.5	35.1	67.9	67.2
Ethnic Iden- tification	48.9	59.3	62.5	43.1	68.1	52.2	87.9	87.3
Identifica- tion, Canada	65.7	71.0	37.1	32.0	40.7	29.6	64.2	77.5
Total number of respon- dents=427	44	67	68	38	98	73	13	26

tion they enjoy in the Canadian society compared with the other ethnic groups.

On the balance, hypothesis one is accepted, education is found to be positively related to assimilation. The relationship is most marked in the areas defined in this study as social integration and economic integration.

2. Since the British and Americans speak English, they are left out of the language scale.

TABLE IV-3: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON AGE OF ARRIVAL INTO CANADA

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of Respondents with Low Score on Assimilation Scale							
	Britus		West Europeans		East Europeans		Third World Countries	
	Education		Education		Education		Education	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Summary Scale	88.0	76.3	37.9	17.0	42.7	25.8	58.1	76.0
Language Behavior	—	—	22.7	22.7	42.3	36.1	72.6	72.2
Social Integration	55.0	41.6	73.2	59.2	71.7	57.0	73.6	59.9
Economic Integration	65.9	33.9	53.0	45.6	56.1	48.2	58.9	39.2
Problem of Adjustment	51.3	49.6	48.5	59.7	57.3	33.8	53.3	68.3
Ethnic Identification	48.3	60.4	62.5	40.9	65.4	54.8	80.3	92.0
Identification, Canada	62.9	75.1	37.1	29.8	34.1	36.9	43.3	81.8
Total number of respondents = 427	44	67	68	38	98	73	13	16

Hypothesis 2: There will be a positive relationship between the amount of education received in the host country and the score on the assimilation scale.³

There is little or no relationship between the summary scores on the assimilation scale and the place in

3. In testing this hypothesis, the ethnic origin of the respondents and their level of education were used as controls. Control variables - age of arrival and year of arrival into Canada were abandoned due to insufficient sample size.

which immigrants received their education. Immigrants who are educated in Canada do not appear in an overall way to be more assimilated - as assimilation is measured in this study- than those of a similar education level who are not educated here. The major reason for this lack of any significant relationship between the summary scale of assimilation and the place of education is the contradictory results found between the scores on the different subscales and the place where immigrants have received their education. (See Table IV-4)

TABLE IV-4: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PLACE OF EDUCATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON ETHNIC ORIGIN AND THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of respondents with low score on Assimilation scale	
	Education	
	Within Canada	Outside Canada
Summary Scale	49.16	50.64
Language Behavior	35.85	37.97
Social Integration	53.90	65.30
Economic Integration	45.34	49.72
Problem of Adjustment	58.99	42.30
Ethnic Identification	54.70	64.01
Identification, Canada	44.12	53.62
Total number of Respondents=427	222	205

There is a positive and significant relationship between the place of education and the subscales social integration and ethnic identification. Immigrants who have education in Canada show a greater desire to asso-

ciate with people outside their ethnic group (ethnic identification). Only 55% of those with education in Canada are reluctant to associate with people outside their own group as compared to 64% of those without education in Canada; only 54% of those with education in Canada tend to have friends primarily within their own ethnic group compared to 65% of their counterparts with no education in Canada. There is also a slight positive though not significant relationship between the place of education and the subscales of language behavior, economic identification and identification with Canada. Immigrants with no education in Canada tend to use English less often in their daily life, to be more dissatisfied with their jobs and to show a greater tendency to retain the citizenship of their former country.

These positive relationships are offset by the negative relationship between education in Canada and the subscale problems of adjustment on initial arrival in Canada. Immigrants educated in Canada are more likely to feel lonely, to perceive problems in adjusting to city life or in finding a job on his arrival to Canada. About 59% of those with education in Canada have this feeling compared with 42% of those who have no education in Canada. Two interpretations of this finding can be suggested depending on the time the immigrants received his education in Canada.

For those who were educated in this country immediately after their arrival here, this sense of having problems of adjustment may be a function of the demands the education system of Canada made on the individual, trying to impose new values on the individual and change his way of life. For the others who received their education some time after their arrival into Canada, the difficulties in adjusting to the Canadian way of life might have prompted them to seek an education in Canada. This in turn helps the immigrants to become more assimilated into the Canadian society.

The relationship between the place immigrants received their education and the score on the assimilation scale is further re-examined for immigrants coming from different parts of the world. For immigrants coming from Europe and North America the same lack of positive relationship between the two variables is found in the summary scale which can be explained by the same pattern of inconsistent relationship between education in Canada and the subscales of assimilation. But for the immigrants coming from the 'third world countries', the picture is different. Among this group there is a significant relationship between the scores on the summary scale of assimilation and the place where education was received (whether in Canada or overseas). Those who received their education in Canada seem to have a lower score on the assimilation scale. The negative relationship is very

TABLE IV-5: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PLACE OF EDUCATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of Respondents With Low Score on Assimilation Scale							
	Britus		West European Education		East European in Canada		Third World Countries	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Summary Scale	75.6	84.5	33.6	28.4	31.6	36.3	79.9	63.3
Language Behavior	—	—	20.4	20.1	40.8	38.2	62.7	78.2
Social Integration	36.6	53.9	65.6	74.4	56.9	68.6	64.3	63.3
Economic Integration	43.8	47.7	41.5	47.1	45.2	56.4	59.4	34.8
Problem of Adjustment	58.5	44.0	56.3	45.7	54.7	38.5	84.2	44.7
Ethnic Identification	45.1	59.9	59.0	57.6	51.7	64.6	86.3	88.9
Identification, Canada	67.7	71.6	29.0	42.2	30.5	38.8	66.6	78.0
Total number of respondents=427	47	64	47	59	74	97	15	24

significant on the subscales problems of adjustment and economic integration. A possible interpretation for the negative relationship as found in the subscale problems of adjustment has been suggested in the above paragraph. The higher standard of living in the Canadian society compared with those of Asia, Africa or South America might partly explain the negative relationship found in the subscale of economic integration. Persons educated in Canada are more likely to compare their living stan-

dard with the Canadian one, while those with no education in Canada tend to use the living standard of their home country (which is usually lower than the Canadian one) as the criterion and hence they are more satisfied with their economic position.

Despite these many reservations, it can be said that there is some positive relationship between education in Canada and the rate of assimilation, persons who have obtained some education in Canada are likely to be assimilated to a greater degree than those who have education in Canada. Regardless of their ethnic origin, there is a positive relationship between having been educated in Canada and one's identification with Canada. Immigrants educated in this country are more likely to identify themselves with Canada than those without education here. With regard to integration assimilation, the immigrants educated in Canada are more likely to associate with Canadians and to be more satisfied with their economic conditions. However they feel that they have more difficulties in initially adjusting to Canadian ways of life. The only exception is with immigrants from the 'third world countries' who tend to be more dissatisfied with their living standard when they have received some education in Canada. There is also a positive relationship between cultural assimilation (language behavior) and the place of education for immigrants coming from Asia, South America or Africa but no significant relationship exists for immigrants coming from outside these countries.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a negative relationship between the presence of discrimination and the score of assimilation.⁴

Since the experience or perception of the presence of discrimination in the host society can reduce a person's chance of being assimilated, it is hypothesised that there will be a negative relation between the perception of discrimination and score on the assimilation scale. In testing this hypothesis, it is found that on the summary assimilation scale, a higher percentage of immigrants who are aware of the presence of discrimination in Canada have a lower score on the assimilation scale than those who do not. About 52% of those who are aware of the presence of discrimination obtain a low score on the assimilation scale compared to 42% of the other group.

The hypothesis is further substantiated when one looks at the subscales. The percentage difference on the social integration scale is as great as 16%. Immigrants who feel that discrimination is present or have experienced discrimination themselves do not mix as much with people outside their own ethnic group than those counterparts

4. In testing this hypothesis, the level of education, the place of education and the ethnic origin of the respondents are controlled simultaneously for immigrants coming from Europe and North America. Immigrants from the 'third world countries' are excluded from the main analysis because of insufficient sample size. In testing this hypothesis for this fourth group, the variables level of education and place of education are used separately as controls.

who are not aware of discrimination in the Canadian society. For the other subscales, even though the relationship is not significant, the negative relationship persists; that is, persons who perceive or have experienced discrimination tend to have low scores on the subscales of language behavior, economic integration, problems of adjustment or ethnic identification.

An important and very significant exception to this negative relationship has to do with naturalisation (identification with Canada). There is a positive relationship between perceived discrimination and identification with Canada, only 32% of those who perceive the presence of discrimination are reluctant to naturalise

TABLE IV-6: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND THE ETHNIC ORIGIN OF THE RESPONDENTS

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage with Low Score on Assimilation	
	Discrimination	
	Yes	No
Summary Scale	52.03	42.30
Language Behavior	35.17	30.15
Social Integration	67.32	50.78
Economic Integration	49.24	42.53
Problem of Adjustment	53.81	46.51
Ethnic Identification	57.13	53.64
Identification, Canada	32.00	51.89
Total number of respondents	205	222

as Canadian citizens compared with 52% who do not not perceive any discrimination. A possible interpretation for this willingness of immigrants who perceive the presence of discrimination in the Canadian society to want to acquire Canadian citizenship is to ward off the disabilities (e.g. to acquire certain posts in the government) experienced by aliens and to procure priveleges belonging to citizens only.

In Table IV-7 and Table V-8, similar patterns of relationship emerge when one looks at each ethnic group individually. For the British and the Americans, Eastern and Western Europeans, there is a negative relationship between discrimination and the scores on most of the subscales which make up the assimilation scale. For the Americans and the British, with the exception of the subscales identification with Canada and ethnic identification, a negative relationship between discrimination and assimilation is found in all the other subscales. Among the Western Europeans, the only significant positive relationship is found in the subscale of identification with Canada. Among the Eastern Europeans only a significant negative relationship between discrimination and assimilation can be found. When the relationship is not in the expected direction, the percentage difference remains insignificant. Generally speaking, immigrants coming from Europe and North America are less assimilated if they feel that there is discrimination in Canada than those who feel that they are being equally treated.

TABLE IV-7: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISCRIMINATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND PLACE OF EDUCATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of Respondents with Low Scores on Assimilation Scale					
	Britus		West European		East European	
			Discrimination			
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Summary Scale	87.2	63.2	37.2	17.6	53.1	35.9
Language Behavior	—	—	19.9	21.7	44.4	36.2
Social Integration	54.8	37.9	75.8	69.0	71.2	58.0
Economic Integration	59.3	28.5	43.4	32.4	57.0	63.4
Problem of Adjustment	51.3	48.3	47.2	51.0	58.2	34.6
Ethnic Identification	47.2	51.3	62.5	48.4	64.6	57.0
Identification, Canada	53.7	70.3	34.6	63.0	33.9	38.2
Total number of respondents=388	77	34	46	60	58	113

TABLE IV-8: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISCRIMINATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON (a) EDUCATION IN CANADA, (b) LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS FROM 'THIRD WORLD' COUNTRIES

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of Respondents with Low Score on Assimilation Scale			
	(a) Standardized on Education in Canada		(b) Standardized on Level of Education	
	Discrimination		Discrimination	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Summary Scale	72.4	61.5	75.6	63.9
Language Behavior	79.9	61.0	79.0	63.8
Social Integration	61.2	70.7	60.9	68.6
Economic Integrat.	53.3	28.9	55.5	28.8
Problem of Adjust.	50.7	80.7	53.7	78.0
Ethnic Identifica.	85.2	89.1	89.3	87.7
Identification, Can.	68.6	74.7	66.8	76.0
Total number of Respondents=39	24	15	24	15

Among the immigrants from the 'third world countries', there is a negative relationship between discrimination and the scores of assimilation. Like the other groups, a positive relationship with discrimination is found in the subscale of identification with Canada. In addition a positive relationship is also found in the subscales of problems of adjustment and social integration. This relationship is very difficult to understand. It seems that when discrimination is perceived to be present these immigrants report a greater readiness to mix with Canadians and state that they have less problems in adjusting to the Canadian society. However one would expect immigrants who perceived discrimination to associate more with people of their own ethnic group and not venture out into the larger society, and to have more problems in adjusting to the host society. But because of the small number of respondents in this immigrant group, too much importance should not be attached to this finding.

Hypothesis 3 is therefore accepted with the reservations and modifications noted above. Persons who perceive discrimination tend to be less assimilated than those who are not aware of any discriminatory attitude of the host members, but they are more willing to become Canadian citizens, most probably to safeguard their interests.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no relationship between the degree of assimilation and the place in which immigrants received their education when the level of education and the perception or experience of discrimination are controlled.

Looking at the summary scale in Table IV-9, it is found that among the European and North American respondents who have perceived the existence of discrimination, those educated in Canada tend to score higher on the summary scale of assimilation. The same significant positive relationship emerges when one looks at the subscales of language behavior, social integration, economic integration ethnic identification and identification with Canada. The relationship however tends to be in the opposite direction on the subscale problems of adjustment with a percentage difference of only about 4%.

Among those who do not perceive discrimination, there is no significant relationship between scores on the summary assimilation scale and whether or not immigrants received their education in Canada. However the trend is in the expected direction, i.e. a higher percentage of those educated in Canada score more highly on the assimilation scale. This positive relationship is also found in the social integration subscale. But a negative relationship is

5. In testing this hypothesis, the level of education, discrimination and ethnic origin of the respondents are controlled simultaneously for immigrants from Europe or North America. Due to the small number of respondents coming from the 'third world countries', they are left out of the analysis.

found in the subscales of language behavior, economic integration, problems of adjustment and identification in Canada. When discrimination is perceived, immigrants in Canada tend to mix more with people outside their own ethnic group than those who are not educated in Canada, but at the same time, they tend to use their mother tongues more often as media of communication, to be less satisfied with their economic condition and to have more problems of adjusting to the Canadian ways of life.

While the direction of the relationship remains consistent in the summary scale, the subscales of social integration, problems of adjustment, ethnic identification whether discrimination is being perceived or not, interaction effect⁶ between education in Canada and discrimination is found in the language behavior, economic integration and identification with Canada subscales. When discrimination is perceived to exist, a positive relationship is found between these subscales and education in Canada; but when discrimination is absent, a negative relationship is found. Persons educated in Canada tend to obtain higher scores on these subscales if they feel that discrimination is present, but lower scores if they are not aware of discrimination. For example, with economic integration,

6. Interaction effect is the possible effect due to the peculiar combinations of two variables. For further details, see H.M. Blalock, Social Statistics, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1960, p. 256.

TABLE IV-9: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PLACE OF EDUCATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION, ETHNIC ORIGIN AND CONTROLLED FOR PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage with Low Score on Assimilation			
	Discrimination		Discrimination	
	Yes		No	
	Education-Canada		Education-Canada	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Summary Scale	47.6	56.9	39.4	45.2
Language Behavior	26.1	37.9	39.2	25.5
Social Integration	63.5	71.9	44.4	59.2
Economic Integration	37.3	65.1	48.7	34.7
Problem of Adjustment	55.2	51.5	54.6	35.2
Ethnic Identification	50.6	65.9	52.9	54.8
Identification, Canada	28.9	36.3	54.8	47.5
Total number of Respondents=388	89	92	79	128

TABLE IV-10: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PLACE OF EDUCATION AND ASSIMILATION STANDARDIZED ON THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Aspects of Assimilation Scale	Percentage of Respondents with Low Score											
	Britus				West European				East European			
	Discrimination				Discrimination				Discrimination			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can	Ed-Can
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Summary Scale	84	89	59	66	33	41	20	15	34	49	30	40
Language Scale	—	—	—	—	12	26	31	14	40	48	43	31
Social Integration	48	59	21	49	80	73	61	76	61	79	56	60
Economic Integration	41	71	41	20	23	61	41	25	47	65	58	50
Problem of Adjustment	53	50	63	39	43	51	67	36	66	53	41	30
Ethnic Identification	37	54	57	48	63	62	42	54	51	76	53	60
Identification Canada	42	61	57	79	26	42	82	47	25	41	40	37
Total number of Respondents	37	40	10	24	22	24	23	37	28	30	46	67

when discrimination is perceived, 27% of those educated in Canada obtain a low score on this scale compared with 65% of those without education in Canada; and when no discrimination is perceived, only 49% of those educated in Canada are not satisfied with their economic conditions as compared with 35% of those with no education in Canada.

When one looks at the different ethnic groups, the same pattern of relationship is found. Whether discrimination is perceived to be present or not, persons with education in Canada tend to score higher on the summary scale, social integration and ethnic identification subscale of assimilation, but to score lower on the subscale of problems of adjustment. Interaction between discrimination and education in Canada is again found in the subscales of language behavior, economic integration and identification with Canada. The only exception arises with the British and the Americans who identify less with Canada whether discrimination is perceived or not.

A possible interpretation for this interaction effect is that when discrimination is present, qualifications obtained outside Canada may not be fully recognized. Immigrants with professional qualifications from their home country may have to undergo re-training or to accept underpaid jobs. Therefore persons with Canadian qualifications tend to be more satisfied economically than those

without. When discrimination is perceived to be absent, persons educated in Canada will not experience this preferential treatment; and using the Canadian standard of living as his frame of reference, tend to be less satisfied than their counterparts with no education in Canada who may still be using the standard of living of the home country (which is usually of a lower one) as the criterion. Besides persons seeking education in Canada may indicate their predisposition to get ahead in the Canadian society. When discrimination is perceived to be present, they tend to use English more often in their daily life (as indicated by their scores on language behavior) and are more willing to acquire Canadian citizenship (identification with Canada) as symbols of their equal status with Canadians. When no discrimination is perceived, the necessity to do so is absent. With the motivation to use English or to apply for Canadian citizenship gone, they tend to use English less often in their daily life and are less willing to give up their own citizenship than their counterparts with no education in Canada possibly to raise their status in the eyes of their own ethnic group. Education in Canada may have made them more conscious of their ethnicity than those who have not such close contacts with the Canadians.

Based on these findings, hypothesis 4 has to be rejected. There is a relationship between education in

Canada and score on the assimilation scale even when the level of education and discrimination are controlled. The findings are very similar to those obtained in the testing of hypothesis 2. The positive relationship with education in Canada is most marked in social integration and ethnic identification. As with the results obtained in testing hypothesis 2, there is a negative relationship between education in Canada and the perceived problems of adjustment. Interaction effect between discrimination and education in Canada is found in the subscales of language behavior, economic integration and identification in Canada, this explains why the relationship between education in Canada and these subscales has not been significant in the findings for hypothesis 2 when discrimination is not controlled.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the four postulated hypothesis are tested and the first three are accepted, the last one is rejected.

It is found that : (1) the level of education has a positive relationship with assimilation, the higher the education level of the immigrants, the more assimilated they tend to be. (2) education in Canada has a positive relationship with assimilation; immigrants educated in

Canada tend to be more assimilated than those who have no education in Canada. (3) discrimination is negatively related to assimilation; immigrants who perceive the presence of discrimination in Canada tend to be less assimilated than those who do not feel that there is discrimination in Canada. (4) a positive relationship between education in Canada and assimilation persists even when discrimination and the level of education are controlled; immigrants with education in Canada tend to be more assimilated than those without when they have the same level of education and have the same perception or experience of discrimination in Canada.

From these findings, it can be generally concluded that persons with a high education level who have acquired part of their education in Canada have a greater chance of being assimilated especially if they do not perceive any discrimination in the host country; immigrants who are conscious of being discriminated, have a low education level and are not educated in Canada are least likely to be assimilated. The results of these findings and their implication for government immigration policy will be further discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this last chapter I shall summarize the research and discuss the findings.

SUMMARY

This study attempts to investigate the relationship between education and assimilation among postwar immigrants in Edmonton and Calgary. The major aim is to analyse how the different aspects of education are related to the assimilation of postwar immigrants in Canada. Another objective is to determine if assimilation is a function of interaction between the immigrants and the members of the host society.

The data of this study were taken from the Alberta Migration Project done by Dr. F. Sukdeo on migration in postwar Alberta. A two-phase disproportional stratified sampling was used. While the sample included Albertans, inter-provincial migrants and immigrants, the present study was only concerned with the immigrants. These immigrants were people born outside Canada, moved into the country after 1946 and were residing in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary during the spring of 1971.

A major part of this research concerned the construction of a research instrument that would give an indication of the assimilation of the immigrants. Assimilation was

defined as the process whereby a person identified himself as a member of a particular society (Identification assimilation), participated in all its institutions (Integration assimilation) and adopted its culture and pattern of life (Cultural assimilation). Assimilation had two aspects - attitudinal (subjective) and behavioral (objective) aspects. The assimilation scale used in the study was built up from questions included in the questionnaire of the Albertan Migration Project. A factor analysis was done on the items chosen and as a result an overall scale with six subscales was produced. The subscales were - language behavior, social integration, economic integration, problems of adjustment, identification with own ethnic group and identification with Canada.

Four hypotheses were formulated after a review of the existing relevant literature. It was postulated that:

1. there will be a positive relationship between the level of education and the score on the assimilation scale.
2. there will be a positive relationship between the amount of education received in the host country and the score of assimilation.
3. there will be a negative relationship between the presence of discrimination and the score of assimilation.
4. there will be no relationship between the degree of assimilation and the place in which immigrants received

their education when the level of education and discrimination are controlled.

The immigrants were divided into four groups - the British and the American, the Western European, the Eastern European and immigrants from the 'third world countries' (countries of Asia, Africa and South America). Wherever possible, age of the immigrants at the time of their arrival and the year of arrival into Canada were controlled in testing the hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was accepted; the more educated were the immigrants, the more likely they were to assimilate into the Canadian society. Hypothesis 2 was accepted with a slight modification, immigrants who were educated in Canada tended to score higher on the assimilation scale with the exception of the subscale problems of adjustment. Hypothesis 3 was accepted. There was a negative relationship between perceived discrimination and assimilation, immigrants who felt that they were being discriminated by the host members were less likely to assimilate into the host society. Hypothesis 4 was rejected. The findings were similar to those in hypothesis 2. A positive relationship was found between education in Canada and the score of assimilation, but persons with education in Canada perceived more problems in adjusting to the Canadian ways of life. There were interaction effects between discrim-

ination and education in Canada as far as language behavior, economic integration and identification with Canada were concerned. When discrimination was felt to be present, immigrants educated in Canada would be more satisfied with their economic conditions, more likely to use English in their daily life, and more willing to apply for Canadian citizenship than those with no education in Canada; when these immigrants were not aware of discrimination in Canada, the reverse would be true. These interaction effects were the reasons why insignificant relationship between education in Canada and these two subscales occurred in the findings for hypothesis 2.

DISCUSSION

Assimilation

The questionnaire was formulated in the winter of 1970 when I was still searching around for a specific topic for the study, some information which I would like to have included in the assimilation scale could not be obtained. No information was available on why immigrant applied for citizenship or why he did not. Still the scale of assimilation seemed an adequate instrument to indicate the degree of a person's assimilation in its various aspects of Canadian life. Such a claim, as seen in Chapter 3, is justified on both theoretical and statistical grounds.

As expected the concept of assimilation was a complex one. The different aspects of assimilation were related to different factors in varying degrees. For example, economic integration (i.e. one's satisfaction with one's economic status) was more strongly related to their level of education while social integration (i.e. association with people outside one's ethnic group) appeared to be more related with having obtained education in Canada.

While the different subscales correlated with each other positively,¹ the subscale problems of adjustment was found to correlate negatively with education in Canada while the rest of the subscales correlated positively with the variable. Those who felt they had more problems in adjusting to life in Alberta, e.g. loneliness or difficulties in finding a job on their arrival in Canada were more likely to mix with Canadians or to identify with Canada. Having problems of adjustment was according to Richmond, an indication of a feeling of 'desocialization and alienation'.² A consequence of this process of desocialization might be a feeling of insecurity and a need to belong to the new country. In fact, Richmond went so far as to say that the process of desocialization was a necessary condition for any fundamental change in

1. See Appendix B, p.147.

2. A Richmond, op. cit., p. 220.

identification as shown by a desire for naturalisation. Therefore a person with more problems of adjustment on his arrival into Canada might eventually be more assimilated than one who did not have similar experience of desocialization.

Such an attempt to interpret data collected in this kind of questionnaire survey points to one of its weaknesses as a research instrument. It is obvious that when respondents attempted to answer such questions as 'When you first came to Alberta, did you have any problems in the way of life in Alberta?', the replies are likely to be subject to faults in the memory of the respondents. Also this questionnaire type of survey provided only a superficial assessment of a person's degree of assimilation. It purports to measure only the degree of a person's assimilation at the time of the survey. Assimilation was a complex process which could not be effectively investigated by the methods used in this investigation. For an investigation into the process of assimilation, it would be necessary to employ a different research technique enabling detailed histories to be collected and more intensive studies to be made.

Education and Assimilation

The findings revealed a positive relationship between the level of education of the respondents and their scores on the assimilation scale. Generally speaking, a person

with a high level of education tends to be more assimilated than one with a lower level of education.

The relation of the level of education of the respondents with their degree of assimilation in Canadian society is most marked in the area of integration assimilation. Regardless of the immigrants' ethnic origin, they tend to be more integrated socially and economically into the Canadian society if they have a high level of education. Persons with higher level of education would earn larger incomes and be more satisfied with their living conditions than those with a lower education level. This might be a reflection of the achievement orientation of the Canadian society where job allocation is based primarily on one's educational achievement. A person who has more years of formal education is more likely to be on a higher occupational scale, to have a higher living standard and a greater probability of being satisfied with his living conditions than one with less years of formal education.

This close correlation between a person's educational qualification and his occupational status might also have an influence on his social integration. A person who is educated is likely to enjoy a high socio-economic status and tend to move out from the neighbourhood of his ethnic enclaves which is usually of a low economic area. Based on his professional connections and his

residential neighbourhood, he has a greater chance to make friends with people outside his own ethnic group or to attend a church not serving a neighbourhood where a large number of people of his own ethnic group lives.

The relationship between education and the other aspects of assimilation is less clear cut. The relationship between education and cultural assimilation as indicated by the use of English in one's daily life is weak. But the scores reveal an interesting finding. The cultural background of the immigrants is a more important variable than education. For the Europeans, over 50% of the respondents tend to use English in their daily life as opposed to 25% of the immigrants from the 'third world countries'. The large percentage of respondents who obtained a high score on this scale compared with the other subscales is also an indication of the importance of the mastery of English in the assimilation process. It is the first area in which the immigrant becomes assimilated.

In the process of identification assimilation whereby an immigrant identifies himself as a member of the host society, the influence of education differs with the different ethnic groups. While the relationship between the level of education and identification assimilation is negative for immigrants from the 'third world countries',

and the British and the Americans, it is positive for the other Europeans. As indicated in the preceding chapter, this is probably due to the cultural bias in the education system and the nature of the culture of the home country. A person with a high level of education would probably be more socialized into the values, beliefs, traditions and intellectual heritage of his own society than one with a lower level of education. Therefore an immigrant from the 'third world countries' where the culture is very different from the Canadian one would find it harder to assimilate into the Canadian society than his European counterpart with the same level of education or his compatriots with a lower education level. The British and the Americans on the other hand tend to have a strong sense of the superiority of their own culture. This ethnocentricity again is more pronounced with the highly educated and hence they find it harder to assimilate. On the other hand, the European culture compared with those of the 'third world countries' is more similar with the Canadian one, and those with a higher education, as indicated earlier have more opportunities to interact with the host members and acquaint himself with their customs and values. Due to their higher educational qualification, they are more easily accepted by the Canadian government than their counterparts of a lower education level as citizens.

As a further check on the point that it is not just the level of education but the place where it was received (i.e. inside or outside Canada) that is related to assimilation, the level of education was controlled in testing the existence of a relationship between education in Canada and the degree of assimilation. It is found that those who have some education in Canada tend to be more assimilated than those with no education in Canada.

In the area of cultural assimilation, there is no relationship between having education in Canada and the language behavior of the Europeans, but it has a significant positive relationship with that of immigrants from the 'third world countries'. This indicates that the tendency to use English in one's daily life is not a function of the educational level, but rather a function of the amount of interaction with the host members as far as immigrants from the 'third world countries' are concerned.

Having education in Canada is positively related to the immigrants' score on integration assimilation. This relationship is less marked in the subscale of economic integration, when the level of education is controlled, indicating that satisfaction with economic status is more strongly related to one's level of education. However the relationship is most marked in social integration, indicating the possibility that interaction within the educational institutions may open up more opportunities for interaction with Canadians. But it will be recalled that education

in Canada has a negative relationship with problems of adjustment. This finding as indicated in Chapter 4 is difficult to interpret unless further information is obtained.

The place where one obtained his education is especially related to identification assimilation. A person educated in Canada is more willing to apply for Canadian citizenship and less willing to associate with people of his ethnic group. This suggests that interaction with Canadians within the school system may overcome the initial fear of mixing with aliens and lead to a willingness to mix with people outside his ethnic group. It also appears to confirm the view that formal educational institutions in a country transmit not only skills and knowledge, but also play an important role in passing on the culture of a society. Though the emphasis on socialization is considerably reduced as one moves up the education ladder, the secondary and post-secondary institutions continue to act as agents for socialization, transmitting the culture of the host country in a less direct way, through the books and magazines available in the libraries, the activities of the students, the attitudes of the teachers and professors. As a result, a person educated in Canada is more ready to mix with people of other ethnic groups and to apply for Canadian citizenship.

It can therefore be said that education is positively related with assimilation in three ways - the qualification provided by one's years of formal schooling, the cultural bias of the education system and the opportunities for interaction with the host members provided by one's education. Another important variable influencing a person's assimilation is the culture of the country from which he comes. Hence a person with high education level is more likely to be assimilated than his counterpart with a lower education, and an immigrant from Europe is more likely to be assimilated than one from the 'third world countries' of Asia, Africa or South America even if they have attained the same educational level.

Interaction and assimilation

Since I was working with data from another's research project, items indicating the interaction of an individual with the host members within the educational institutions were not available. Items like a person's peer group membership or his participation in school clubs could not be included to indicate the person's frequency of interaction with the host members, so it was assumed that a person with education in Canada would automatically have more contact with members of the Canadian society than one who had never attended any Canadian educational institutions. Information about the feeling of being discriminated against in the educational institution also could not be obtained.

However it was inferred that a person who felt that he was being discriminated by the host members would probably also feel discriminated against in the educational institution.

If having education in Canada is synonymous with experiencing more interaction with Canadians, then it can be said from the findings that the more frequent the interaction with the host members, the more assimilated a person tends to be. This relationship holds even when discrimination and the level of education are controlled. As seen in the previous section, having education in Canada tends to increase a person's degree of assimilation. It is being argued here that attendance at an education institution in Canada increases the frequency and amount of interaction between the immigrants and the host members.

Interaction not only leads to more interaction, but can even change a person's frame of reference. If no discrimination is perceived, a person educated in Canada (and by this experience has had more frequent interaction with the host members) tends to raise his level of aspiration and to be less satisfied with his economic condition than a person with no education in Canada. While recognizing the effects of education and

discrimination, another possible interpretation is that an immigrant with less frequent contact with Canadians tends to compare his living standard with that of his home country. Since the living standard of Canada is generally better than those of Europe or of the developing countries, a person with less frequent contact with Canadians tends to be more satisfied with his economic conditions than one with more frequent contact. This same rationale (that frequent interaction can change a person's outlook) also explains why a person with more interaction with Canadians tends to identify more with Canadians than one with less frequent contact with them.

But the frequency of contact with the Canadians is not the only variable connected with assimilation. The way the immigrant perceives that he is being treated by the host members also is an important element. If an immigrant perceives that he is being discriminated by the host members, that is, he is being rejected and differently treated, he will identify less with that group. On the other hand, if he finds himself being accepted by the host members, he will identify more with them. The findings from this study confirms this hypo-

thesis. A negative relationship between perceived discrimination and assimilation is present in all the subscales of assimilation. This relationship is most pronounced in the subscales of integration assimilation. This is because integration assimilation is concerned with a person's participation within the institutions of the host society. If he feels himself being rejected, he will tend to withdraw from contact with the host members into his own ethnic enclaves and becomes dissatisfied with the attitude of the host members. The chance that he will identify with the host society is less.

However there is a significant positive relationship between discrimination and identification with Canada, that is, a person who feels that he is being discriminated against is more willing to become a Canadian citizen. On the surface, it seems to contradict the view that a person who finds himself not accepted by a group to identify less with that group. But the attitude of the host members, important as it may be, is not the only consideration involved. A person will apply to become a Canadian citizen if he thinks that becoming a member of that group can secure him privileges. A person may feel insecure as a result of this feeling of

being discriminated. To safeguard his rights and position in the Canadian society, he is ready to accept Canadian citizenship. This same rationale also explains why a person educated in Canada identifies more with Canada when discrimination is being perceived than one with no formal education in Canada. Formal examinations may be imposed on aliens in certain occupations, they have to pass these examinations or even to undergo re-training before they are qualified to practise in Canada. Hence a person with some years of education in Canada or has a Canadian qualification of some sort will identify more with the host members because he now possesses the necessary instrument to fulfil his economic if not any other goals in the Canadian society.

A person who has more frequent interaction with the host members is more likely to be assimilated than one with less opportunity for interaction and one who feels himself being discriminated by the host members tends to be less assimilated than one who feels he is being equally treated. But it is found that the immigrant group who is educated in Canada (i.e. having more opportunities for interaction with the host members) and does not feel being discriminated against is not necessarily those with the highest scores on the assimilation scale. This is because of the complexity of the process of assimilation. As indicated in the

TABLE V-1: DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON THE ASSIMILATION³
SCALE BY ETHNIC ORIGIN OF THE RESPONDENTS

Aspects of Assimilation Scale		Britus	West European	East European	Third World Countries
Summary Scale	High	18.51%	69.0%	64.2%	29.4%
	Low	81.5%	31.0%	35.8%	70.6%
Language Behavior	High	—	76.0%	59.1%	27.8%
	Low	—	34.0%	40.9%	72.2%
Social Integration	High	52.6%	33.5%	35.6%	36.3%
	Low	47.4%	66.5%	64.4%	63.7%
Economic Integration	High	52.1%	46.1%	46.6%	55.0%
	Low	47.9%	53.9%	53.4%	45.0%
Problems of Adjustment	High	49.1%	45.5%	53.6%	36.3%
	Low	50.9%	55.5%	46.4%	63.7%
Ethnic Iden- tification	High	74.8%	44.6%	39.6%	11.5%
	Low	25.2%	55.4%	60.4%	88.5%
Identifica- tion, Canada	High	30.2%	65.0%	63.8%	29.5%
	Low	69.8%	35.0%	36.2%	70.5%
Total number of Respondents=427		111	106	171	39

³. For a more meaningful distribution of scores, one should consult the tables presented in Chapter 4.

preceding paragraph, the immigrants with no education in Canada who feel that they are being equally treated by the host members tend to score higher on the economic integration scale than any other groups. This is probably a result of the different frames of reference used by the immigrants educated in and outside Canada. Therefore it is even more difficult to answer the question as to who is more assimilated, the one with education in Canada but does not feel that he is being discriminated or one who feels being discriminated but is educated in Canada. In general it can be concluded that while greater interaction between the immigrants and the host members is not the only reason for his assimilation, it does have an important bearing on a person's assimilation.

Comparison of Ethnic Groups

Contrary to the government's implied assumption that the British are the most easily assimilated among the ethnic groups, the British and the Americans in this study do not appear to be more assimilated than the others as the term is used in this study. It is true that they have less language problems and find it easier to get along with the Canadians. But they do not appear to have less problems of adjustment on arrival than the other groups. (See Table V-1) The most interesting finding is that they are extremely disinclined to become Canadian citizens. Only 30% of the respondents from this group want to do so.

This finding becomes more pronounced among the highly educated. A possible reason is that there is less disability attached to a British immigrant than immigrants from any other country. As a result, the incentive to apply for Canadian citizenship is not as great. For the Americans, their frequent visits to their home country might have made the severing of ties more difficult. If the policy of the Canadian government is to absorb permanent settlers with a sense of Canadian identity, then this group does not appear to be the best choice.

The Western Europeans are the easiest to assimilate among the four groups. Excluding the British and the Americans, they are the most likely to use English in their daily life. There is no great difference from the British and the Americans in their degree of economic satisfaction or difficulty in adjusting to the Canadian society. They show a tendency to associate with people of their own group. This tendency may be a reflection of the difference between Canadian and European society. Interpersonal contact at all levels in Canada seems to have a greater informality than in Europe. The educated in Europe cannot command deference or any manifestations of class distinction they used to enjoy at home from the Canadians. So they prefer to mix with their own group. This cultural difference further explains why the educated from Europe find it

harder to adjust to the new surroundings than their counterpart with a lower education level. In contrast to the British and the American unwillingness to apply for Canadian citizenship, 65% of these immigrants have obtained or are willing to become Canadians. This is an indication that they are more likely to regard Canada as their permanent home.

The degree of assimilation of the Eastern Europeans is comparable to those of the Western Europeans. The distribution of high and low scores among the Eastern Europeans is very similar to those of the Western Europeans. However Eastern Europeans tend to use English less often in their daily life and have more problems of initial adjustment than the Western Europeans. This might suggest that the Eastern European culture is more different from the Canadian one than the Western European culture. Another possible interpretation lies in the low education level of the Eastern Europeans. They are mostly refugees from the communist countries as Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia or Hungary, they have come into Canada without being screened on their education level or their ability to use English. Hence they have more problems in adjusting to the Canadian way of life and find more difficulty in using English in their daily life. Also because they have fled from their home countries as refugees, their degree of dissatisfaction with their home governments must have been great. They are grateful to the freedom offered

by the Canadian government and are willing to show their allegiance and gratitude by adopting Canadian citizenship. They feel great insecurity in their status until they have become Canadian citizens, and are therefore more inclined to take up Canadian citizenship.

Immigrants coming from the 'third world countries' of Asia, South America and Africa are the hardest to assimilate and they are the least likely to use English in their daily life. They are more likely to be socially isolated and not to participate in activities of the Canadians than any other group. They find more difficulty in adjusting to life in Alberta. They are more likely to associate with their own group and less likely than any other groups to apply for Canadian citizenship. Although those with a high education level tend to mix more with Canadians and are more satisfied economically, they are even more conscious of their ethnic identity and even less likely to become Canadian citizens. On the basis of this finding, it may be suggested that the government's policy of screening immigrants on the basis of their ethnicity in the 1940's and 1950's is not without ground.

Practical Implications for Government Immigration Policy

It is unwise to make any conclusive evaluation of the Immigration Act of 1962 only nine years after its application. Besides the sample only includes immigrants

from Edmonton and Calgary. Though it can claim to provide some indication to the efficacy of the immigration policy of the Canadian government in Alberta, these findings cannot be generalized to the whole of Canada and should be interpreted with much caution.

The findings indicate that the emphasis on the British as a possible source of immigrants is not a wise one. Though the British are more easily assimilated culturally and socially, they are very unlikely to share a sense of Canadian identity. They are most unwilling to apply for Canadian citizenship.

The Europeans from outside Britain appear to be the best choice. They are most likely to apply for Canadian citizenship. They are as easily economically integrated as the British and do not have more difficulty adjusting in the Canadian society than the British. Though they show a greater tendency to associate with members of their own group, this practice is not contradictory to the government policy of multiculturalism encouraging them to retain their culture so long as it does not interfere with their functioning in the Canadian society. It has been shown in this study that a more educated person tends to assimilate more easily than a less educated one, and that more interaction with the host members tends to increase a person's degree of assimilation. With the government's emphasis on education as the criterion for admitting immigrants into Canada, these educated Europeans will

eventually be assimilated into the Canadian society with their increased years of residence in Canada.

Based on the findings of this study, the emphasis of the government on the education level of the immigrant appears to be a justifiable one. But while those with a higher education tend to be more easily assimilated, it has also been found here that those who have received some education in Canada tend to be more easily assimilated than those with similar levels of education but which have been obtained outside Canada. From this, it would seem that the government should not only emphasise the education level of immigrants but also their willingness to undergo re-training or education in Canada, such a move will not only make their skill more relevant to the Canadian society, but also increase their tendency to become assimilated.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE - IMMIGRANT SCHEDULE

- 1a. Where were you born?
(If outside Canada, mark country according to
present boundaries)
- 01 Canada
 - 02 Britain
 - 03 Ireland
 - 04 Germany
 - 05 Italy
 - 06 Netherlands
 - 07 Portugal
 - 08 U.S.S.R. (incl. Ukraine)
 - 09 Poland
 - 10 Other East European
 - 11 U.S.A.
 - 12 Greece
 - 13 Other (specify)
 - 14 N.S.
- 1b. Code 0
- 1c. Code 0
- 1d. was this in a
- 1... large town or city
 - 2... small town
 - 3... farm or country
 - 4... N.S.

If ever married ask:

1e. Where was your wife (husband) born?

- 01 Canada
- 02 Britain
- 03 Ireland
- 04 Germany
- 05 Italy
- 06 Netherlands
- 07 Portugal
- 08 U.S.S.R. (incl. Ukraine)
- 09 Poland
- 10 Other East European
- 11 U.S.A.
- 12 Greece
- 13 Other (specify)
- 14 Not stated (N.S.)

1f. If spouse born in Canada, in which province was she (he) born?

- 1 Alberta
- 2 Saskatchewan
- 3 Manitoba
- 4 British Columbia
- 5 Ontario
- 6 Maritimes
- 7 Quebec
- 8 Other
- 9 N.S.

2. What place do you now consider to be your home?

3. In what year did you first move to

(a) Canada _____

(b) Alberta _____

(c) Edmonton _____

Code 000

4a. How many persons are there in your household?

1 One

2 Two

3 Three

4 Four

5 Five

6 Six

7 Seven

8 Eight or more

9 N.S.

4b. What is your age?

01 under 19

02 20-24

03 25-29

04 30-34

05 35-39

06 40-44

07 45-49

08 50-55

09 55-59

10 60-64

11 65-69

12 70 or over

13 N.S.

4c. How old were you when you left your place of birth?

4d. What was your marital status when you left your country of birth?

- 1 married
- 2 single
- 3 separated
- 4 divorced
- 5 widowed
- 6 N.S.
- 7 Inap.

4e. What is your present marital status?

- 1 married
- 2 single
- 3 separated
- 4 divorced
- 5 widowed
- 6 N.S.
- 7 Inap.

4e(i). How many live children have been born to you and your (former, late) wife(husband)?

- 1 no children
- 2 one
- 3 two
- 4 three
- 5 four
- 6 five
- 7 more than 5
- 8 N.S.

4f. How many years of education do you have?

_____ years

4g. What type of education have you completed?

- 1 Elementary school
- 2 Some high school
- 3 Completed high school
- 4 Some university
- 5 university degree
- 6 vocational
- 7 Other (Specify)
- 8 N.S.

4h. how many years of education did you have before
you came to Canada?

_____ years

4i. What type of education did you have before you
came to Canada or Alberta?

Record as many as apply

- 1 Elementary school
- 2 Some high school
- 3 Completed high school
- 4 Some university
- 5 University degree
- 6 Vocational
- 7 Other (specify)
- 8 N.S.
- 9 Inap.

4j. Have you had any further education in Canada?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

How many years?

_____ years

4k. What type of education have you acquired in Canada?

- 1 Elementary school
- 2 Some high school
- 3 Completed high school
- 4 some university
- 5 university degree
- 6 Vocational
- 7 Other (specify)
- 8 N.S.
- 9 Inap.

5a. What is your nationality?

5b. What ethnic group do you belong to?

5c. What is the ethnic-racial group of your father?

5d. From which ethnic group is your spouse?

6a. What made you decide to leave your old country?

6b. Why did you choose Canada when you decided to leave your old country?

6c. which province did you first go to?

- 1 Alberta
- 2 Ontario
- 3 Quebec
- 4 B.C.
- 5 Manitoba
- 6 Saskatchewan
- 7 Maritimes
- 8 Others
- 9 no special province
- 0 D.K.

7a. If not Alberta, ask:

What made you decide to leave your previous province?

7b. Why did you decide to come to Alberta?

7c. why did you finally come to Edmonton/Calgary?

8a. DO You plan to remain permanently in Alberta?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

8b. If no, ask:

Where do you plan to go?

8c. Before you left your country, how did you get to know about Alberta?

9a. Who were the first members of your family to come to Canada?

9b. What other members of your family came later?

9c. How long after the arrival of your ...(See Q.9a) did your ...(See Q.9b) come to Canada?

	9a.	9b.	9c. (years)
Wife	1	1	
Husband	1	1	
1st child	1	1	
2nd child	1	1	
3rd child	1	1	
4th child	1	1	
Other children	1	1	
Parents	1	1	
Brothers/Sisters	1	1	
Self (single)	1	1	
None	1	1	
N.S.	1	1	

10. Who paid for your passage to come to Canada?

- 1 Self
- 2 Relatives in Canada
- 3 Relatives at home
- 4 Friends
- 5 Government
- 6 Came with parents
- 7 Other
- 8 N.S.

11a. What was the name of the city, town or village, where you first arrived in Alberta?

11b. Where or with whom did you stay in Alberta on the day of your arrival?

- 1 With relatives
- 2 With friends from old country/province
- 3 Other friends
- 4 Hotels, motels, etc.
- 5 Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., (public organizations)
- 6 house, apartment
- 7 Other
- 8 N.S.
- 0 Inap

12. How long did you stay at this first place?

- 1 Less than a week
- 2 One to two weeks
- 3 Three to four weeks
- 4 Two months
- 5 Three to four months
- 6 Five to six months
- 7 Seven to twelve months
- 8 More than a year
- 9 N.S.

13a. How many different places in Alberta besides Edmonton/Calgary have you ever lived in?

13b. Besides Alberta, what other provinces have you ever lived in for more than three months?

- 13c. How many times have you changed your address in Edmonton/calgary in the last five years?
-

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about this house/apartment which your family is occupying.

- 14a. How many rooms are there in this house/apartment, that is, kitchens, bedrooms, living rooms and finished rooms in attic or basement?

- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five
- 6 Six
- 7 Seven
- 8 Eight or more
- 9 D.K.
- 0 Inap.

- 14b. Is this house/apartment owned by you or a member of your household, or is it rented/

- 1 Rented
- 2 Owned by respondent and/or spouse
- 3 Free rent in lieu of work
- 4 Owned by relatives
- 5 Other
- 6 D.K.
- 7 N.S.

14c. Ask all home owners

After you started to work in Canada, how long did it take you to get your own house?

- 1 Less than one year
- 2 Two years
- 3 Three years
- 4 Four years
- 5 Five years
- 6 Six to eight years
- 7 Nine to ten years
- 8 More than ten years
- 9 D.K.
- 0 Inap.

14d. Could you tell me what mortgage you pay each month?

- 1 Less than \$50
- 2 \$50 - \$90
- 3 \$100 - \$124
- 4 \$125 - \$149
- 5 \$150 - \$174
- 6 \$175 - \$199
- 7 \$200 and more
- 8 Pay no mortgage
- 9 N.S.
- 0 Inap

14e. Do you own any other property?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

If yes, ask:

14r. Is it in Canada or elsewhere?

- 1 Canada
- 2 Elsewhere
- 3 Canada and elsewhere
- 4 N.S.
- 5 Inap.

Ask all renters

15a. Could you tell me what rent you pay each month?

- 1 Less than \$50
- 2 \$50 - \$99
- 3 \$100 - \$149
- 4 \$150 - \$199
- 5 \$200 - \$249
- 6 \$250 - \$299
- 7 \$300 and over
- 8 D.K.
- 9 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

15b. Do you plan to buy a house within the next three years?

- 1 Go on renting
- 2 Buy within three years
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.
- 5 Inap.

16a. Do most people you know well belong to your ethnic group?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

16b. If you had a choice, would you rather live in an area where most people were of the same ethnic group as yourself?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't Care
- 4 D.K.
- 0 N.S.

16c. Why do you feel that way?

17. What do you consider to be the yearly income of an average Canadian?

- 01 Under \$1,500
- 02 \$1,500 - \$2,999
- 03 \$3,000 - \$4,499
- 04 \$4,500 - \$5,999
- 05 \$6,000 - \$7,499
- 06 \$7,500 - \$9,999
- 07 \$10,000 - \$12,999
- 08 \$13,000 - \$15,999
- 09 \$16,000 - \$18,999
- 10 \$19,000 or more
- 11 D.K.
- 12 N.S.
- 00 Inap.

18. Which class do you belong to?

- 1 Upper
- 2 Middle
- 3 Lower
- 4 Working
- 5 Other (specify)
- 6 class doesn't exist
- 7 D.K.
- 8 No answer

19a. Do you have a religious preference? That is, are you Protestant, Roman Catholic or of other persuasion?

19b. Do you attend a church which mainly serves your ethnic group?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

If religion stated, ask:

19c. How many times have you attended services at church/synagogue in the last four weeks?

- 1 Not at all
- 2 Once
- 3 Twice
- 4 Three times
- 5 Four or more times
- 6 D.K.
- 7 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

20. Of what country are you a citizen?

- 1 Canada
- 2 Country of birth
- 3 Other
- 4 D.K.
- 5 N.S.

If not a Canadian citizen, ask:

20b. Do you plan to become a Canadian citizen?

- 1 definitely yes
- 2 Probably yes
- 3 uncertain
- 4 definitely not
- 5 N.S.
- 6 Inap.

20c. Why do some people who qualify for Canadian citizen not apply for it?

21a. What language did you speak when you were a child?

21b. If mother tongue not English, ask:

Have you found difficulties in getting along in your daily life because your mother tongue is not English?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

21c. What language do you most often use at home when speaking to your wife(husband)?

21d. What language do you most often use at home when speaking to your children?

21e. When your children speak to you, what language do they use?

21f. When your children speak to each other, what language do they use?

21g. What language do you most often use at work?

22a. Before coming to Canada, was your last home in a village, farm, a small town, or in a large town or city?

- 1 Large town or city
- 2 Small town
- 3 village, farm or country
- 4 Other
- 5 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

22b. when you arrived in Alberta did you first settle in a ...

- 1 large town or city
- 2 small town
- 3 village or country
- 4 other
- 5 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

23a. When you first came to Alberta, did you have any problems in

	Yes	No	D.K.	N.S.	Inap.
<u>Getting a job</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Finding somewhere to live</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>English language</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Ways of life in Alberta</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>city life</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Loneliness</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Other problems</u>	1	2	3	4	0

23b. Since you arrived in Alberta, have you ever made use of any of the following organizations or facilities?

	Yes	No	D.K.	N.S.	Inap.
<u>Manpower center</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>English language classes</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Services of the federal</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Immigration branch</u>					
<u>Inter-faith Organization</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>Other organizations spe-</u>	1	2	3	4	0
<u>cializing in help or</u>					
<u>advice to immigrants</u>					

24a. Did you work in your former country?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

If yes to 24a, ask:

24b. What was your last main occupation there?

24c. Since you came to Alberta, how many times did you change your job?

24d. Now, I would like to ask you about the jobs you had in Alberta and how long it took to find each:

- a Present job
- b 1st job
- c 2nd job

25a. During this last week, were you working...

- 1 full-time
- 2 Part-time
- 3 Both full-time and part-time
- 4 Not all all

If not working at all, ask:

25b. What is the main reason for not working?

- 1 Temporary lay-off
- 2 Looking for work
- 3 On strike, vacation, illness
- 4 Permanently unable to work
- 5 Retired, idle
- 6 Going to school
- 7 Domestic duties
- 8 Other (specify)
- 9 D.K.
- 0 N.S.

25c. what is (was) your main full-time occupation?

25d. How did you find that job?

- 1 Through friends of relatives in Canada
- 2 Through the Canada Manpower Centre
- 3 Through provincial agencies
- 4 Through own inquiry
- 5 Other (specify)
- 6 D.K.
- 7 N.S.

25e. During the last 12 months, have you been unemployed?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

25f. For how many weeks?

25g. If in labour force, ask:

Are you now doing the type of work you planned to do when you left your country?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

25h. Why is that?

25i. How many people over 16 years of age in your household work?

Total no.: _____

25j. Who are the people who work?

- 1 Head of household
- 2 Spouse
- 3 One child
- 4 Two children
- 5 Mother
- 6 Father
- 7 Other relatives
- 8 Other persons, not relatives
- 9 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

26a. Since you first came to Canada, have you paid any visits to your former country?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 N.S.
- 4 Inap.

If yes, ask:

26b. What was the longest period of time you spent there?

- 1 Two weeks or less
- 2 Two weeks to one month
- 3 One to two months
- 4 Two to four months
- 5 Four to six months
- 6 Six to twelve months
- 7 More than a year
- 8 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

27a. Have you ever encouraged people from your old country to come to Alberta?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

If yes, ask:

27b. Have you ever helped them in

	Yes	No	N.S.	Inap.
Getting a job?	1	2	3	0
Finding a place to live?	1	2	3	0
Paying their passage?	1	2	3	0

Ask everybody

28. How is life in Alberta different from life in your old country?

29a. Why do you think people sometimes leave Alberta for other provinces in Canada?

29b. why do you think some people leave Alberta to live permanently abroad?

30. where was your mother born?

31. Where was your father born?

32a. How many dependents do you have abroad that you intend to send for?

- 1 None
- 2 One
- 3 Two
- 4 Three
- 5 Four
- 6 Five
- 7 Six or more
- 8 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

If dependents in 32a., ask:

32b. How much longer will it take you to have all these dependents in Canada?

- 1 Less than six months
- 2 One year
- 3 Two years
- 4 Three years
- 5 Four years
- 6 Five years
- 7 Six or more years
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

Now I would like you to give me your opinion on the following:

33a. The opportunities for your children?

33b. Your standard of living?

33c. The way of life of young people today?

33d. More immigrants coming in?

34a. Do you think the immigration laws of this country should be changed?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

If yes, ask:

34b. In what ways should they be changed?

35. How many children do you think an average Canadian family should have?

- 1 No children
- 2 One child
- 3 Two children
- 4 Three children
- 5 Four children
- 6 Five children
- 7 More than five children
- 8 Any number
- 9 N.S.
- 0 Inap.

36a. Using this card, please tell me the number or the category in which your yearly earnings (that is, wages and salaries) fall.

- 01 Under \$1,500
- 02 \$1,500 - \$2,999
- 03 \$3,000 - \$4,499
- 04 \$4,500 - \$5,999
- 05 \$6,000 - \$7,499
- 06 \$7,500 - \$9,999
- 07 \$10,000 - \$12,999
- 08 \$13,000 - \$15,999
- 09 \$16,000 - \$18,999
- 10 \$19,000 or more
- 11 D.K.
- 12 N.S.
- 13 Inap.

36b. Using this card, please tell me the total earnings of your entire family from all sources. Include wages, salaries, rents, investment income and so on for all persons.

- 01 Under \$1,500
- 02 \$1,500 - \$2,999
- 03 \$3,000 - \$4,499
- 04 \$4,500 - \$5,999
- 05 \$6,000 - \$7,499
- 06 \$7,500 - \$9,999
- 07 \$10,000 - \$12,999
- 08 \$13,000 - \$15,999
- 09 \$16,000 - \$18,999
- 10 \$19,000 or more
- 11 D.K.
- 12 N.S.
- 13 Inap.

37a. In your opinion, is there any ethnic discrimination in Alberta?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

If yes, ask:

37b. What groups experience such discrimination?

37c. what kinds of discrimination do they experience?

37d. Have you personally experienced ethnic discrimination?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 D.K.
- 4 N.S.

Now I would like to ask you about elections.

38a. If you were eligible, would you vote in a federal, provincial or municipal election?

- 1 yes
- 2 no
- 3 It depends
- 4 D.K.
- 5 N.S.

38b. At such an election, would you prefer to vote for a person of your own ethnic group?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Doesn't matter
- 4 It depends
- 5 D.K.
- 6 N.S.

39. When you were sixteen years old, what was the main occupation of your father or whoever was responsible for the support of the household?

40. How much money does your family send out of Canada on the average per month?

- 1 No money
- 2 Not much money
- 3 Less than \$25
- 4 \$25 - \$49
- 5 \$50 - \$74
- 6 \$75 - \$99
- 7 \$100 - \$199
- 8 \$200 or more
- 9 D.K.
- 0 N.S.

41a. What do you like most about Alberta?

41b. What do you dislike most about Alberta?

41c. What do you like most about this city?

41d. What do you dislike most about this city?

.....

APPENDIX B

THE ASSIMILATION SCALE

I. QUESTIONS INCLUDED IN THE ASSIMILATION SCALE

1. Which class do you belong to? (Q. 18)
2. Are you now doing the type of work you planned to do when you left your country? (Q. 25g)
3. Please tell me the category in which your yearly earnings fall? (Q. 36a)
4. Do most people you know well belong to your ethnic group? (Q. 16a)
5. If you had a choice, would you rather live in an area where most people were of the same ethnic group as yourself? (Q. 16b)
6. Do you attend a church which mainly serves your ethnic group? (Q. 19b)
7. Intermarriage. (Q. 5b, c)
8. At such an election, would you prefer to vote for a person of your own ethnic group? (Q. 35b)
9. Of what country are you a citizen? (Q. 20)
10. Do you plan to become a Canadian citizen? (Q. 20b)
11. When you first came to Alberta, did you have any problems in the way of life in Alberta? (Q. 23a)
12. ...any problems in loneliness? (Q. 23a)
13. I would like you to give me your opinion on the standard of living? (Q. 33b)
14. What language do you most often use at home when speaking to your wife(husband)? (Q. 21c)
15. ... to your children? (Q. 21d)
16. When your children speak to you, what language do they use? (Q. 21e)
17. What language do you most often use at work? (Q. 21g)
18. Have you found difficulties in getting along in your daily life because your mother tongue is not English? (Q. 21b)

IV VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

Items	Factors ₁	2	3	4	5	6
1	0.07	0.50	0.80	0.04	-0.09	0.35
2	-0.01	0.17	-0.32	-0.23	-0.05	0.45
3	0.17	0.27	-0.13	-0.05	0.38	0.47
4	0.08	-0.11	0.04	0.28	0.57	0.08
5	0.14	-0.01	0.09	0.77	0.16	-0.04
6	-0.05	0.12	-0.10	0.17	0.62	-0.22
7	-0.26	-0.21	0.11	-0.14	0.56	0.16
8	0.01	0.06	-0.02	0.74	0.01	0.08
9	0.19	-0.02	0.83	0.00	0.01	0.10
10	0.23	0.05	0.83	0.06	0.00	-0.01
11	0.03	0.72	-0.03	0.09	0.07	0.08
12	0.02	0.66	0.03	-0.02	-0.07	0.03
13	0.02	0.12	0.15	0.09	0.05	0.68
14	0.71	0.08	0.16	0.09	0.14	0.01
15	0.86	0.09	0.08	0.06	-0.01	0.02
16	0.84	-0.01	0.05	0.03	-0.14	0.04
17	0.73	-0.02	0.19	0.04	-0.10	-0.07
18	0.59	-0.01	0.13	-0.04	0.03	0.06

III FACTOR MATRIX USING PRINCIPAL FACTOR, NO ITERATIONS

Items \ Factors						
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	-0.25	-0.41	-0.24	0.09	0.06	0.30
2	0.11	-0.44	-0.32	-0.13	-0.11	-0.01
3	-0.14	-0.51	0.03	0.21	-0.13	0.11
4	-0.02	-0.18	0.58	0.25	-0.02	-0.05
5	-0.19	0.01	0.46	0.29	-0.30	-0.03
6	0.09	-0.14	0.42	0.19	-0.07	0.12
7	0.26	-0.16	0.33	0.13	0.23	-0.19
8	-0.13	-0.06	0.36	0.26	-0.45	0.11
9	-0.49	0.14	0.04	0.44	0.46	-0.14
10	-0.54	0.17	0.05	0.35	0.47	-0.09
11	-0.21	-0.54	-0.16	-0.01	0.02	0.28
12	-0.14	-0.46	-0.14	-0.02	0.18	0.31
13	-0.18	-0.38	-0.08	0.27	-0.07	0.03
14	-0.69	0.00	0.24	-0.13	-0.03	0.03
15	-0.79	0.02	0.05	-0.11	-0.13	-0.01
16	-0.76	0.08	-0.04	-0.14	-0.16	-0.10
17	-0.72	0.14	0.08	-0.25	-0.04	-0.13
18	-0.59	-0.08	0.22	-0.40	0.05	-0.12

V. CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE ASSIMILATIONSUBSCALES

Subscales	Language Behavior	Social Integra- tion	Economic Integra- tion	Problem of Adjust- ment	Ethnic Identi- fication	Identi- fication Canada
Summary Scale	0.74	0.29	0.42	0.46	0.40	0.50
Language Behaviour		-0.08	0.05	0.13	0.14	0.35
Social Integration			0.06	-0.06	0.19	0.00
Economic Integration				0.31	-0.02	-0.04
Problems of Adjustment					0.01	0.07
Ethnic Iden- tification						0.10
Identifica- tion Canada						

APPENDIX C

INDEPENDENT AND CONTROL VARIABLES

A. Questions included as independent variables:

4f. How many years of education do you have?

4j. Have you had any further education in Canada?

37a. In your opinion, is there any ethnic discrimination in Alberta?

37d. Have you personally experienced ethnic discrimination?

B. Questions included as control variables:

1a. Where were you born?

3a. In what year did you first move to Canada?

The age of the immigrant at the time of his arrival in Canada is estimated from his present age and the year he first moved to Canada.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Allport, G.H., The Nature of Prejudice. New York: Doubleday, 1958.
- Banks, O., The Sociology of Education. London: B.T. Barsford, Ltd., 1968.
- Banton, M., The Coloured Quarter. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1955.
- _____, Race Relations. Toronto: Tavistock, 1967.
- Baranyi, N., The Relationship between the Level of Formal Education and Integration of Immigrants. Unpublished M.S.W. Thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1963.
- Barron, M.L., People Who Intermarry. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1948.
- _____, Minorities in a Changing World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967.
- van den Berghe, P.L., Race and Racism. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Berry, B., Race Relations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.
- Borrie, W.D., The Cultural Integration of Immigrants. Paris: UNESCO, 1962.
- _____, Italians and Germans in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1954.
- Brown, F.J. and J.S. Roucek, One America. New York: Prentice Hall, 1945.
- Canada, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Integration of Immigrants in Canada. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1956.
- Canada, D.B.S., Canadian Statistical Review. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, annually.
- Corbett, D.C., Canada's Immigration Policy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.
- Coughlin, R.J., Double Identity: The Chinese of Modern Thailand. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Cox, O.C., Class, Caste and Race. New York: Doubleday Inc., 1948.
- Elliot, J.L., Immigrant Groups. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Inc., 1971.

- Forcese, D.P. and S. Richer, Stages of Social Research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1970.
- Gordon, M.M., Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Harman, H.H., Modern Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Hobart, C.W., Persistence and Change, monograph, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969.
- Hughes, E.C. and H.M. Hughes, Where Peoples Meet. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952.
- Johnston, R., Immigrant Assimilation. Perth: Paterson Brokensha Pty. Ltd., 1965.
- Kalbach, W.E., The Impact of Immigration on Canadian Population. Ottawa: D.B.S., 1970.
- Kent, D.P., The Refugee Intellectual. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.
- Klineberg, O., Characteristics of the American Negro. New York: Harper Co. Ltd., 1944.
- Kosa, J., Land of Choice. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954.
- Lesser, A., The Pawnee Ghost Dance: A Study of Cultural Change. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.
- Lieberson, S., Language and Ethnic Relation in Canada. Toronto: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Locke, A. and B.J. Stern, Where Peoples Meet. Hines: Haden & Eldridge, 1946.
- Mayer, J.E., Jewish Gentile Courtship. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Nie, N.H., et. al., Statistical Package for the Social Science. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.
- Park, P.E., Old World Traits Transplanted. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- _____ and G.W. Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Petersen, P., Planned Migration, The Social Determinants of the Dutch Canadian Movement. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.
- Rees-Powell, A.T., Differentials in the Integration of Dutch and Italian Immigrants in Edmonton, Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.
- Reynolds, L.G., The British Immigrant. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1935.

- Richmond, A., Post-war Immigrants in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- Saenger, G., Today's Refugee, Tomorrow's Citizen. New York: Harper, 1941.
- St. Claire, D. and H.R. Cayton, Black Metropolis. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Schermerhorn, R.A., Comparative Ethnic Relations. New York: Random House Inc. Ltd., 1970.
- Shibutani, T. and M.K. Kwan, Ethnic Stratification, A Comparative Approach. London: McMillan Co., 1969.
- Simpson, G.E. and J.M. Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Stonequist, E.V., The Marginal Man. New York: Scribner, 1937.
- Sukdeo, F., Alberta Migration Project Report, No. 1-10. Edmonton: H.R.R.C., 1971-2.
- Taft, D. and R. Robbins, International Migration. New York: Ronald Press, 1955.
- Warner, W.L. and L. Srole, Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups. New York: Yale University Press, 1945.

B. ARTICLES

- Angus, H.F., "The Future of Immigration into Canada", Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, Vol. 12, 1946, p. 379-386.
- Barclay, H.B., "An Arab Community", Anthropologica, Vol. 10, 1968, p. 143-156.
- Besher, J.M., et. al., "Ethnic Congregation-segregation", Social Forces, Vol. 42, 1964, p. 482-489.
- Beth, M.W., "The Elite and Elites", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 48, 1942, p. 746-755.
- Broom, L. and J.I. Kitsuse, "Validation of Acculturation", American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, 1955, p. 44-48.
- Brown, W.O., "Nature of Race Consciousness", Social Forces, Vol. 10, 1931, p. 91-99.
- Cressey, G.B., "The Anglo-Indians, a disorganized marginal group", Social Forces, Vol. 14, 1935, p. 263-268.

- Dohrenwend, B.P. and R.J. Smith, "Assimilation", Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 18, 1962, p. 30-46.
- Eisenstadt, S.N., "Reference Group Behavior and Social Integration", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 19, 1954, p. 175-185.
- Francis, E.K., "Variables in the Formation of So-called Ethnic Groups", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 60, 1954, p. 6-14.
- Gillin, L., "Parallel Culture and the Inhibition to Acculturation", Social Forces, Vol. 24, 1945, p. 1-14.
- Isaacs, E.R., "Group Identity and Political Change", Daedalus, Vol. 43, 1967, p. 353-375.
- Kroeber, A.C., "Diffusion" in Encyclopaedia of the Social Science, Vol. 3, 1931, p. 139-142.
- La Piere, R. "Attitudes vs Actions", Social Forces, Vol. 13, 1934, p. 230-237.
- Lee, R.H., "The Decline of Chinatown in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 54, 1949, p. 422-432.
- Park, P.E., "Assimilation", Encyclopaedia of the Social Science, Vol. 2, 1930, p. 281.
- Roucek, J.S., "Lithuanians Immigrants in America", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 41, 1936, p. 447-453.
- Simons, S.E., "Social Assimilation", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 7, 1901, p. 386-404.
- Spiro, M.E., "Acculturation of American Ethnic Groups", American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, 1955, p. 1241-1251.
- Watson, J.B., "Caste as a Form of Acculturation", Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 19, 1963, p. 356-379.
- Williams, R.E., "The Reduction of Intergroup Tension", Social Science Bulletin, Vol. 57, 1947, p. 58.

